DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 026	24	HE 000 459

By-McCormack, Sister Maureen
Study of Existing Student Value Patterns for Selected Catholic College Women. Final Report.
Loretto Heights Coll., Denver, Colo.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-7-H-005
Pub Date 1 Nov 68
Grant-OEG-1-7-070005-4354(057)
Note-137p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.95
Descriptors-Church Related Colleges, Ethical Values, Faculty Evaluation, *Higher Education, *Intellectual Development, *Moral Values, *Personal Values, Religious Differences, *Religious Education

A 117-item questionnaire, entitled WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, was developed and administered to a sample of 1315 women in two Catholic liberal arts colleges as part of a study designed to identify common patterns of religious, moral, and intellectual-aesthetic student values. Related purposes of the study were to determine whether the value patterns of faculty-selected "ideal" students differed from those of average students, to gain insight into faculty values by involving them in the study, and to assess the relationship between student values and background factors such as academic performance, prior educational experience, religious practice, and educational and life goals. Three of 4 hypotheses were confirmed: (1) that faculty-selected "ideal" students would have better high school grades, college GPAs, College Board scores and scores on intellectual-aesthetic values than "non-ideals," that they frequently attended intellectual and fine arts events, but did not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable, (2) that background factors studied would affect student values in such a way that intellectual values would be positively correlated with academic ability, achievement indicators and related interests, and (3) that attendance at Mass, reception of Holy Communion and frequency of confession would be correlated with religious and moral values. The 4th hypothesis, that no inter-school differences in values held by students in the two colleges would be found, was not confirmed. Recommendations for future research are included. (WM)

ED026026

BR 7-H-005
PA-24
OE-BR

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-H-005
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070005-4354 (057)

STUDY OF EXISTING STUDENT VALUE PATTERNS FOR SELECTED CATHOLIC COLLEGE WOMEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

November 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE000459

Final Report

Project No. 7-H-005
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070005-4354 (057)

STUDY OF EXISTING STUDENT VALUE PATTERNS FOR SELECTED CATHOLIC COLLEGE WOMEN

Sister Maureen McCormack

Loretto Heights College

Denver, Colorado

November 1, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 3

- Background Information 4
- Definitions 5
- Hypotheses. 7

PROCEDURES USED TO DEVELOP THE INSTRUMENT. . 9

- Introduction 9
- Phase I: Development of the Preliminary Instrument 9
- Phase II: The Principal Study 13
- Summary 17

THE FACULTY-NOMINATED "IDEAL" STUDENTS. . . 18

- Rationale 18
- Procedure. 18
- Results 19

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 24

- General Description of the Factors 24
- Factor I: Religious Practices and Attitudes 32
- Factor III: Moral Values (Honesty) 40
- Factor VIII: Intellectual Values 43
- Factor X: Aesthetic Values. 45

Page

Factor II: Consensual Religiosity 47

Factor IV: Moral Values (Cheating on Examinations and Stealing) 49

Factor V: Moral Values (Jealousy, Revenge) . . . 51

Factor VI: Moral Values ("Catty," Scandalous, Risque Stories) 51

Factor VII: Moral Values (Racial Prejudice) . . . 54

Factor IX: Intellectual Values (World Affairs and Reading Interest) 56

Summary of the Discussion of the Ten Factors . . . 56

Comparison of Faculty-Nominated "Ideal" Students with Other Students 58

Intercorrelations Among the Variables 62

Summary 66

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 68

Recommendations for Higher Education 68

Specific Recommendations Pertinent to the Present Study 69

REFERENCES 72

APPENDIX A 87

APPENDIX B 91

APPENDIX C 93

APPENDIX D 95

APPENDIX E 121

APPENDIX F 123

Page

APPENDIX G 126

APPENDIX H 128

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Major Sources of Questionnaire Items (Phase 1) and Number of Items in Each Category	11
2	Judges' Evaluations of the Questionnaire Items	12
3	Distribution of the Sample of 1156 Students by Class and School	15
4	Number of Faculty-Nominated "Ideal" Students by Schools and Number of Votes Received by Each Student	20
5	Qualities of Excellence in "Ideal" Students Singled Out by the Greatest Number of Faculty	22
6	Rotated Factor Matrix--School I	25
7	Rotated Factor Matrix--School II	28
8	Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Size for Factors by Schools	31
9	Factor Loadings and Communalities by Schools for the Ten Factors	33
10	Percentage Response to Selected Items[1] from Factor I: Items on Relationship with God and Christian Development (N = 1156)	37
11	Percentage Response to Selected Items[1] from Factor I: Religious Practices and Traditional Catholic View (N = 1156)	38
12	Percentage Response to Selected Items[1] from Factor III: Moral Values (N = 1156)	41
13	Percentage Response by Schools to Selected Items[1] from Factor VIII: Intellectual Values	44
14	Percentage Response by Schools to Selected Items[1] from Factor X: Aesthetic Values	46
15	Percentage Response to Items from Factor II: Consensual Religiosity	48

Table		Page
16	Percentage Response to Items from Factor IV: Moral Values (Cheating; Stealing).	50
17	Percentage Response to Items from Factor V: Moral Values (Jealousy; Revenge)	52
18	Percentage Response to Items from Factor VI: Moral Values ("Catty," Risque, Scandalous Stories)	53
19	Percentage Response to Items from Factor VII: Moral Values (Prejudice) (N = 1156)	55
20	Percentage Response to Items from Factor IX: Intellectual Values (World Affairs and Reading Interest) (N = 745, School I; N = 411, School II).	57
21	Correlation Matrix[1] of Variables on which "Ideals" had Significantly Different Scores from "Non-Ideals"--School I	59
22	Correlation Matrix[1] of Variables on which "Ideals" had Significantly Different Scores from "Non-Ideals"--School II.	60
23	Correlations of Factors VIII and IX with Academic Ability, Achievement Indicators and Related Interests: Hypothesis 2	63
24	Correlation of Religious and Moral Values with Selected Religious Practices: Hypothesis 3 (N = 1156)	65

SUMMARY

The purposes of this study were to identify patterns of religious, moral and intellectual-aesthetic values in Catholic college women, to determine whether a group of faculty-nominated "ideal" students held different values from students not so selected, and to assess the relationship between student values and certain background factors (academic performance, family background, prior educational experience, religious practices, educational experience, religious practices, educational and life goals).

A questionnaire, entitled WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, was developed, having been evaluated by ten judges and pre-tested in a pilot study, and then was administered to 1315 Catholic women in two liberal arts colleges. The data were factored by the method of Principal Components. Orthogonal rotation was accomplished by means of Kaiser's Varimax approximation to simple structure. A cross-validation design was applied to the data in order to check the findings from one half of the sample in the other half of the sample. Sundland's procedure for identifying "true" factors, accomplished by determining where the sample eigenvalue curve crosses the curve based on normalized random data, was employed.

Ten factor-dimensions, which incorporated 116 of the 168 questionnaire items on values, emerged in the final factoring. These were: I - Religious practices, the God relationship and Christian development, II - "Consensual" as opposed to "committed" religiosity, III - Honesty and fairness, IV - Cheating and stealing, V - Jealousy and revenge, VI - Interest in "catty," scandalous and risque stories, VII - Racial prejudice, VIII - Intellectual values, IX - Interest in world affairs, and X - Aesthetic values. Factors I (religious values), III (moral values: honesty), VIII (intellectual values), and X (aesthetic values) contributed most to the variance. The ten factors accounted for about 70 per cent of the total variance.

Three of the four hypotheses developed for the research were confirmed.

1. That a group of "ideal" students selected by the faculty would:

   a. Have better high school grades, college grade point averages and College Board scores than non-ideals."

b. Have higher scores on intellectual-aesthetic values than "non-ideals."

c. More frequently attend intellectual and fine arts events.

d. Not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable.

Confirmed for parts "a," "b," and "c."

2. That background factors selected for study would affect student values in such a way that academic ability, achievement indicators and related interests (Variables 1-4, 7, 29-34, 44) would be positively correlated with intellectual values (Factors VIII and IX). Confirmed for all the variables with F VIII and for all except Variables 1 and 3 with F IX.

3. That attendance at Mass, reception of Holy Communion and frequency of confession (Variables 40-42) would be positively correlated with religious and moral values (Factors I-VII). Confirmed for Variable 41 with all the factors, for Variable 40 with all the factors except F V, for Variable 42 for all the factors except F IV.

4. That no inter-school differences in values held by students in the two colleges would be found. Not confirmed.

Religiosity, assessed by a variety of criteria, appears to be high and multi-dimensional on the two campuses. On items attempting to measure moral values, students are very likely to label certain behaviors as morally wrong, but statements about their probable behavior relative to these issues is not in keeping with the values they profess. It may be, as noted by Havighurst (1962), that moral development for these students is still in progress. There is also room for considerable growth in intellectual values, particularly for School I.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a personal communication with the researcher in April, 1964, Mervin Freedman[1] made the following comments:

> Almost all of the research dealing with college students has been carried out at the largest and most prominent colleges and universities. Yet hundreds of thousands of youth are educated in small colleges about which very little is known. Investigation of these small institutions, denominational and non-denominational, is a crying research need currently.

Dr. Freedman's observation is directly pertinent to Catholic women's colleges about which very little of a scientific nature is known: the kinds of students attracted to these institutions, what happens to them while they are in college and afterwards, what they value, and what kind of impact the institution has on them. Not all of these questions are answerable by means of a cross-sectional study, but a beginning can be made.

Comprehensive awareness of student attitudes, values and interests is basic to the success of collegiate policies and programs. In many Catholic colleges, institutional policies are revised from time to time, often without any sensitivity to the types of students these policies will affect and the degree of appropriateness the changes hold for them. Impressive and costly programs are sometimes launched on these campuses without first ascertaining whether they will be meaningful to those persons who are called upon to implement them or to students who will participate in them. Even in situations where a few key students participate in institutional decision-making concerning matters which affect them, such minimal student representation makes it difficult to assess whether the interests, values, commitments, and goals of the total student body are met by this device. On-going research programs should be initiated on small college campuses, not only to evaluate the effectiveness of the academic programs but to gain a picture of the institutional and personal characteristics which contribute toward or interfere with the growth of the students they serve.

---

[1] Dr. Freedman was a staff member and later director of the Mary Conover Mellon Foundation at Vassar College during intensive studies of values conducted there during the 1950's. He served as one of the ten judges for the questionnaire items for the present study.

The present research project is an attempt to clarify for two Catholic liberal arts colleges for women certain student value patterns prevalent on their campuses. The areas selected for the study were religious, moral, and intellectual-aesthetic values. Intellectual values were chosen because of the natural dedication to this domain which is assumed to be an integral part of higher education. In addition, it would seem that aesthetic values should be given a prominent place in liberal arts colleges. Denominational colleges profess commitment to religious and moral values, but the degree to which these values are operative on such campuses is unclear. Likewise, the extent to which college students, and specifically those in the present study, subscribe to the above-named values has not been sufficiently researched.

A further purpose of the research was to ascertain whether there was an identifiable pattern of values which would distinguish superior, rated "ideal," from average students. By involving the faculty in this part of the research to select a group of outstanding students, some insight into faculty values would also be gained. A final aspect of the problem was to look very briefly at student values against a backdrop of their previous experiences as influenced by selected demographic and background factors. These are Variables 1-4, 7, 40-42, 45-51, 57-65, and 69-71 numbered in Appendix F. It was felt that such information on the students might shed some light on reasons for any differences found within the student groups.

Identification of basic student value patterns, through this study, should contribute to greater understanding of student response to proposed policies and programs at the two colleges and provide foundation for a more intelligent approach to institutional improvement.

Background Information

Some of the early studies on college student values lacked the sophistication of more recent research and often suffered from serious methodological defects. Many studies were cross-sectional in design and more limited in scope than the few longitudinal studies. Difficulties in measuring such an abstract area as human values were evident. Some researchers even questioned whether values were measurable.

Numerous studies used the Allport-Vernon or the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values and the Thurstone Scales on attitudes toward certain religious concepts. The complexity of the religious variable and the various indices of religiosity that have been used were considered in some of the research. Although many of the studies reported growth in religiosity during college and subsequently, other research concluded that, even when this was the case, religion did not seem to have much impact on the daily lives of students. Inconsistency in moral values and moral behavior also appeared to be a frequent pattern observed across studies.

Changes in intellectual values seemed to be due largely to the impact of "intellectual elites" among the student bodies rather than the faculties, courses, or other dimensions of the institution. Vast differences among students within the same institution and across campuses seemed to predominate. In general, critical thinking ability increased as students progressed through college.

Although the literature on religious values among students in Catholic colleges revealed inconsistency, several studies noted high religiosity scores in these students. However, intellectual scores for students in Catholic institutions were consistently lower than for their peers on secular college campuses. In general, the relationship between intelligence and religious beliefs and values is unclear.

It would appear that "the 'student mind' is many-sided, complex, and opaque" and that "a wide spectrum of approaches will be needed to probe it" (Havens, 1963, p. 69).

Definitions

The following terms used in the study are defined and a description of the use made of some of them is given:

Values: Those entities which are viewed by the individual as intrinsically desirable and worthy of serious human pursuit. In the present study, those things which students say they prize are considered to be valuable to them.

Religious Values: Those values which concern a person's relationship with God, the worship of God, and his relationships with his fellow worshippers. Relationship with God is assessed in this research by items such as: "I am filled with a sense of gratitude for all God has done for me." Worship of God, broadly conceived, includes a wide variety of religious practices. An illustration of a relationship with fellow worshippers is: "I think I would enjoy telling others about God and His love for us."

Moral Values: Those values which guide man's thoughts and actions relative to right and wrong, good and evil. Great diversity was present in types of items used to measure these values. Examples of thoughts and behaviors employed are: honesty, charity, and justice.

Intellectual Values: Those values which relate to study, reflection, speculation and devotion to mental pursuits. Items measuring intellectual appreciation of the artistic domain (aesthetic values) were also included. Examples of these items are: "I can easily become absorbed in readings recommended by a professor for 'those who wish to pursue the matter further.'" "Courses in literature and poetry have been as satisfying to me as most other subjects."

"Ideals;" "Non-Ideals:" Terms used for students whom faculty members selected as outstanding and those who were not so chosen.

Factor Analysis: A method of analyzing "a set of observations from their intercorrelations to determine whether the variations represented can be accounted for adequately by a number of basic categories smaller than that with which the investigation was started" (Fruchter, 1954, p. 1).

Factor Loading: The coefficients on a factor matrix which give the correlation between test or item scores and the factor on which they load.

Factor Matrix: A table which gives the correlation between test and item scores and factors.

Factor: "A source of variation operating in two or more variables;" "the dimension of the space required to contain a certain set of correlations when they are spatially represented" (Cattell, 1952, pp. 26, 37).

Communality (h^2): "The proportion of the total variance which a test has in common with other tests in a given correlation matrix, a variance which thus gives rise to correlation between the given test and the others" (Magnusson, 1967, p. 180).

Eigenvalue or Latent Root: Root of a characteristic equation used in obtaining the percentage of variance a given factor contributes to the total variance.

Orthogonal Rotation: A procedure for placing the factors so that simple structure is achieved. In contrast to oblique rotation, any two factors which are rotated maintain their 90° separations.

Simple Structure: "A factor pattern in which factorial complexity is held to a minimum" and factors are rotated to psychologically meaningful positions (Rozeboom, 1966, p. 284).

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed for the study:

1. That a group of "ideal" students selected by faculty would:
   a. Have better high school grades, college grade point averages, and College Board scores than "non-ideals."
   b. Have higher scores on intellectual-aesthetic values than "non-ideals."
   c. More frequently attend intellectual and cultural events.
   d. Not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable.

Faculty members are trained to recognize good academic performance and intellectual potential. This characteristic would probably lead them to select as "ideal" more students who demonstrated intellectual potential, academic achievement, and interest in programs with intellectual or aesthetic appeal. Since it was felt that these considerations would overshadow other factors that faculty might recognize in students, it was also hypothesized that "ideals" would not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on other variables. (See Appendix F for the other variables of the study.)

2. That background factors selected for the study would affect student values in such a way that academic ability, achievement indicators, and related interests (Variables 1-4, 7, 29-34, 44) would be positively correlated with intellectual values. Although students are sometimes seen as striving for grades without having a concomitant intellectual interest in more than academic requirements, it was projected that these two areas would be positively correlated.

3. That attendance at Mass, reception of Holy Communion, and frequency of confession would be positively correlated with religious and moral values. Religious practices should affect the extent to which religious and moral values are endorsed, unless the practices are performed in a perfunctory manner with little meaning for the person involved.

4. That no inter-school differences in values held by students in the two colleges would be found. Although at the time of the study, changes in administrative practices and curricular programs were taking place much more rapidly at School II than at School I, it was hypothesized that differences in values for students in the two schools would not be found because of the cultural lag between the introduction of new programs and effects of these changes in a total student population. The two colleges were administered by the same congregation of teaching Sisters, so a similar spirit characterizing the religious congregation should be found on both campuses.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES USED TO DEVELOP THE INSTRUMENT

Introduction

The development of a suitable instrument for measuring religious, moral, and intellectual values of students involved two phases. Phase I comprised the following steps:

(1) Selection of items from standardized instruments, e.g., the Omnibus Personality Inventory

(2) Construction of new items by the researcher.

(3) Evaluation of the initial pool of items by ten judges

(4) Revisions of the preliminary instrument based on the recommendations of the judges

(5) Addition to the questionnaire of items which would give background information on the students which could be correlated with the items on values

(6) A pilot study conducted with a sample of sixty college women

(7) Detailed discussion of the questionnaire items with some of the subjects in the pilot study

(8) A factor analysis of the data from the pilot study

(9) Further revision of the preliminary instrument

Phase II, the principal study, involved administering the questionnaire to a sample of 1315 college women on two Catholic campuses and a factor analysis of the data.

Phase I: Development of the Preliminary Instrument

From the literature reviewed on values, over thirty standardized measuring instruments were selected for careful analysis in order to find items which could be used to measure religious, moral, and intellectual values of college women. Nineteen of these instruments contained items which seemed appropriate for the present study. Together they yielded a total of 170 items. Some of the items selected from the instruments were edited by the researcher in either form or content before they were incorporated into the new instrument. The editing was undertaken in order to bring about greater consistency in form and to make the content more relevant and applicable to the sample of students to be used in this study. (Identification of the source instruments and items is given in Appendix A.)

Additional items were needed so that as the poorer ones were eliminated during the questionnaire revisions, approximately fifty items in each value category would be retained in the final draft of the instrument. Those selected to measure values in religious, moral, and intellectual areas were grouped according to specific topics within these areas in order to ascertain whether wide content coverage had been achieved. New statements and questions were then written for content areas not previously covered or only sparsely so. This process netted a total of 95 additional items.

Table 1 shows the two major sources of questionnaire items and the number of items in each category. At this stage of the questionnaire development, 66 per cent of the items were selected from standardized instruments; 34 per cent were written specifically for this study.

In December, 1965, the 265 items contained in the preliminary questionnaire were submitted to ten judges representing the fields of theology, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and institutional research at four educational institutions and one community agency. They were chosen by the researcher on the basis of experience and competence in their respective fields. Four of the judges were professors at School I in this research; three were associated with School II. Of the three remaining judges, one was an authority in research on college student values, another was a clinical psychologist in a community agency, and the third was a theologian at a Catholic university. The task given to the judges was to decide whether an item measured a religious, moral, or intellectual value, according to the definitions given in Appendix C. (See Appendix B for a copy of the letter sent to the judges and Appendix C for instructions given them.) Results of the judges' evaluations are charted on Table 2.

TABLE 1

Major Sources of Questionnaire Items (Phase 1) and Number of Items in Each Category

Item Category	Item Source		
	Standardized Instrument	Original	Total
Religious Values	37	52	89
Moral Values	38	48	86
Intellectual Values	85	5	90
Total	160	105	265

TABLE 2

Judges' Evaluations of the Questionnaire Items

Number of Items	Number of Judges Agreeing on Placement of Items
150	10
44	9
27	8
221	
44[1]	7 or fewer

---

[1] Items receiving endorsement from seven or fewer judges were not included in the final scale.

The criterion for retaining an item in the questionnaire was that it be placed in the same category by eight of the judges. Eighty-four per cent, or 221 of the 265 items, successfully met the criterion. All ten judges agreed on the placement of 150 (57 per cent) of the items. Of the 221 items on which agreement was reached, 65 items were classified as religious values, 79 were classified as moral values, and 77 were categorized as intellectual values.

Items retained in the preliminary instrument which tapped student values comprised Section 2 of the questionnaire. Section 1, containing 28 items which would yield background information on the students, was added so that relationships between student values and certain dimensions of their backgrounds could be ascertained. Areas covered in Section 1 included academic performance, family background, prior educational experience, religious practices, educational and life goals.

The preliminary questionnaire, now comprised of 249 items, was entitled WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK. In this form it was used in a pilot study and administered to a group of 60 college women. In addition to responding to the statements in the usual manner, one-fourth of these subjects volunteered to react to the questionnaire, item by item, in a group discussion. Ambiguities were pointed out. They also indicated reasons for difficulty with certain items and asked questions which gave evidence that some of the items lacked clarity. Revisions, based on their evaluative comments, were made.

The item data were factored in groups of twenty by the Principal Components method. All factors having a latent root above unity were retained. The rotation was accomplished by the Varimax procedure. Factor loadings and communalities were studied as bases for further refinement of the questionnaire. Those items with the lowest factor loadings and communalities were eliminated. A total of 53 items was omitted, leaving 196 items for the final draft of the questionnaire.

Phase II: The Principal Study

The 196-item questionnaire consisted of 28 items to secure background information about the students, 49 items to measure religious values, 61 to measure moral values, and 58 to measure intellectual values. (See Appendix D for a copy of the final draft of the questionnaire, WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS

THINK.) The questionnaire in its final form contained 117 items (60 per cent of the total) from eighteen standardized instruments and 79 or 40 per cent written by the researcher. (Identification of the source instruments and items is given in Appendix A.)

The questionnaire, WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, was administered in September, 1966, to 1315 college students from two Catholic liberal arts colleges for women. The total sample represented 93 per cent of the student body (exclusive of special students and students in the Junior Year Abroad program) at School I and 72 per cent of the student body (with the same exceptions) at School II. At School I the questionnaires were administered at group sessions held for that purpose. At School II the questionnaires were handed out at registration and returned to the registrar's office several days later. Instructions were read to subjects in School I but were printed for subjects in School II. The difference in the procedure of administering the questionnaire may account in part for the lower percentage of questionnaires returned from School II. A total of 1156 usable questionnaires was obtained from the two colleges. Table 3 shows the distribution of the 1156 students among the four classes by schools.

The 168 items in Section 2 of the questionnaire, the section dealing with values, were intercorrelated and three matrices of 49, 70, and 49 items respectively were individually factored by the method of Principal Components (Harman, 1967). Orthogonal rotation was accomplished by means of Kaiser's Varimax approximation to simple structure. (Harman, 1967). The resulting factor matrices were studied and the items grouped according to the magnitude of the factor loadings. The items which did not have meaningfully high loadings were either deleted or kept as separate variables for a second factoring. Those single items which were retained would then have an opportunity to load on factors in one of the two groups with which they had not been previously factored. At this stage of the analysis, 20 items were omitted and 32 were retained as single items. There were 36 items which had high enough loadings to be assigned to one of the factors in the first group of items analyzed; 47 items were assigned to factors in the second group, and 33 items were assigned to the third group.

The factor loading criterion for assigning a variable (item) to a factor was .3 or above. Considering each factor loading as a correlation coefficient between an item and the

TABLE 3

Distribution of the Sample of 1156 Students
by Class and School

Class	School I Number	School I Per Cent	School II Number	School II Per Cent	Total Number	Total Per Cent
Freshmen	298	50	142	35	440	37.5
Sophomores	228	31	99	24	327	27.5
Juniors	125	17	93	23	218	20
Seniors	94	12	77	18	171	15
Total	745	100	411	100	1156	100.0

factor on which it loads, because of the rather large samples, significance would have been indicated with coefficients around .1. A loading of .3 provides protection from including items which might be influenced by chance. In addition, .3 is a very widely used cut-off point. Most of the loadings were higher than .3, ranging up to .9.

A cross-validation design was applied to the data in order to check the findings from one half of the sample in the other half of the sample. The Ss from each school were divided into two groups. Care was taken to insure that the same number of subjects from each class was placed in each of the four groups (two schools, two subgroups per school). Factor loadings were studied for each of the subgroups. Only when there was a factor loading of .3 or above which was consistent across three of the four subgroups was an item retained in the factor.

Sundland's procedure for identifying "true" factors was employed (Sundland, 1967). When a criterion of extracting only factors having eigenvalues above unity is employed, more factors are usually produced than are "true" or "real." The problem is to separate these "true" factors from those which are the result of chance (Horn, 1965). Sundland accomplishes this by determining where the sample eigenvalue curve crosses the curve based on normalized random data. Those eigenvalues above the point where the curves cross are regarded as "real and true;" those below are presumed to be chance products.

In this study, in which the criterion of eigenvalues above unity was used, twenty factors emerged. The number of "true" factors in all the groups of items ranged from five to eleven.

The data were refactored in order to bring together the items on the three separate initial factorings and to establish invariance. Ten factors, including corporately 116 items, emerged in the final solution. Two of these related to religious values, five to moral values, and three to intellectual values. Fifty-two items did not have sufficiently high factor loadings to be included in any of the ten factors.

The final factored matrix was then correlated with the items from Section 1 of the questionnaire, which contributed background information on the students.

Summary

A questionnaire for measuring religious, moral, and intellectual values of Catholic college women was developed and refined during the summers of 1965 and 1966. Ten judges evaluated the instrument. A pilot study was conducted with a sample of 60 college students, the results were factor-analyzed and the questionnaire was revised. In September, 1966, 1315 students from two Catholic women's colleges were administered the revised questionnaire, WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, and the data were analyzed.

CHAPTER III

THE FACULTY-NOMINATED "IDEAL" STUDENTS

Rationale

In an educational institution, the goals of the faculty are a significant aspect of the teaching-learning process. College administrators need to take a look at the values of their faculty, for only if the educational leaders of an institution are aware of these commitments will they be in a position to predict whether the goals they set for the institution are possible of achievement.

Faculty members also can influence students to move in the direction of their highest personal aspirations. Early in their college experience students become aware of faculty expectations and their role in defining academic success. In view of this, faculty values would seem to be important factors in student development during the college years.

If the values of the faculty affect student maturation and the growth of the institution as a whole, then procedures for assessing faculty values need to be developed. Brown (1960) developed an evaluative method in which the faculty at Vassar College was asked to nominate a group of ideal or superior students, and to indicate the basis for their selections. It was assumed that this information would give some indication of faculty values. The same technique was employed in the present research.

Procedure

In September, 1966, all full-time faculty members at the two institutions studied received letters inviting them to nominate a group of superior students whose records would be studied. At School I the president of the college sent the letter to the faculty; the dean of faculties acted similarly at School II. Since there had not been sufficient opportunity for faculty members to know freshmen so early in the year, freshmen were ineligible for nomination. Criteria for selection were not defined for the faculty; they were thus free to determine the types of excellence which would be considered. It was recommended that grade point average not be the main or sole basis for se-

CHAPTER III

THE FACULTY-NOMINATED "IDEAL" STUDENTS

Rationale

In an educational institution, the goals of the faculty are a significant aspect of the teaching-learning process. College administrators need to take a look at the values of their faculty, for only if the educational leaders of an institution are aware of these commitments will they be in a position to predict whether the goals they set for the institution are possible of achievement.

Faculty members also can influence students to move in the direction of their highest personal aspirations, Early in their college experience students become aware of faculty expectations and their role in defining academic success. In view of this, faculty values would seem to be important factors in student development during the college years.

If the values of the faculty affect student maturation and the growth of the institution as a whole, then procedures for assessing faculty values need to be developed. Brown (1960) developed an evaluative method in which the faculty at Vassar College was asked to nominate a group of ideal or superior students, and to indicate the basis for their selections. It was assumed that this information would give some indication of faculty values. The same technique was employed in the present research.

Procedure

In September, 1966, all full-time faculty members at the two institutions studied received letters inviting them to nominate a group of superior students whose records would be studied. At School I the president of the college sent the letter to the faculty; the dean of faculties acted similarly at School II. Since there had not been sufficient opportunity for faculty members to know freshmen so early in the year, freshmen were ineligible for nomination. Criteria for selection were not defined for the faculty; they were thus free to determine the types of excellence which would be considered. It was recommended that grade point average not be the main or sole basis for selection, since this information could be obtained from available records. Lists of all students were accessible to the faculty. No limits were placed on the number of students a faculty member could nominate. Faculty members were also asked to indicate briefly, next to each student's name, the reason she was chosen as "ideal." (See Appendix E for copy of letter sent to faculty for nomination of "ideal" students.)

Results

Fifty-two faculty members from School I chose to nominate "ideal" students. This represented 94 per cent of the faculty who had been associated with the institution for at least one year. Twelve new faculty members had not had sufficient opportunity to become acquainted with the students at the time of nomination. A total of 273 students from School I received votes from at least one faculty member. Forty received six or more votes.

A total of 65 faculty members at School II were eligible to nominate "ideal" students, i.e., they had been associated with the institution at least one year. Of these, 34 faculty members (52 per cent) chose to do so. One hundred and one students received votes from at least one faculty member.

Table 4 shows the number of "ideal" students nominated at each institution and the number of votes received by each student.

Without conducting a survey of faculty at each institution, one could only speculate concerning the significant inter-school differences in number of returns and number of students nominated. In each school, follow-up letters were sent to those who had not responded to the request at the time of the deadline. Some possible reasons for inter-school differences are:

(1) A letter from the president of a college may bring greater response from faculty than a letter from the dean of faculties.

(2) Response to form letters from campus administrators differs from campus to campus.

(3) Extent to which faculty members felt students were well-known to them could have affected the responses.

TABLE 4

Number of Faculty-Nominated "Ideal" Students by Schools and Number of Votes Received by Each Student

Number of Votes Received	Number of Students Receiving Votes School I	School II
23	1	
18	1	
17	2	
15	1	
14	2	
12	3	
11	4	
10	3	
9	5	
8	5	1
7	8	
6	5	1
5	16	1
4	24	1
3	30	8
2	55	20
1	108	69
Total	273	101

(4) Degree of interest in the study may have differed on the two campuses.

(5) The idea of setting up a list of qualities which would permit one to separate "ideal" students from "non-ideal" may appear to be stereotypic to some faculty members or for some other reason may hold little appeal for them.

(6) Those faculty using more stringent criteria for "ideal" would nominate fewer students than those guided by less stringent criteria.

Qualities of excellence used by faculty members as bases for selection included academic, intellectual, and personal characteristics, leadership, and service. These are presented in Table 5. Faculty members in School I seemed more impressed with academic achievers who worked hard than with independent thinkers who demonstrated intellectual curiosity and were able to integrate learning. This interpretation is based on the fact that 84 per cent of the faculty in School I singled out the former type of student for special commendation, whereas less than half of that number cited the latter qualifications as reasons for their nominations. At School II, although the interest in independent learners (44 per cent) is comparable to that found in School I, this category is not overshadowed by endorsement of the hard-working achievers (56 per cent). Pleasing personality characteristics seemed equally important to both groups of faculty (54 and 56 per cent, respectively, for Schools I and II). In contrast, faculty members at School I were much more interested in qualities of leadership (59 per cent as contrasted with 32 per cent for School II), a dedicated, Christian attitude (54 per cent, School I; 20 per cent, School II), and concern for others (38 per cent; 8 per cent) than faculty members at School II.

What does all of this say about a faculty? Do faculty members prefer diligent, hard work from students at the expense of independent thinking and creativity? It would seem that the former quality demonstrated by students would provide feedback to reassure faculty members concerned about teaching success. However, qualities that have the power to direct students far beyond ordinary, academic accomplishment, e.g., intellectual independence, ability to integrate learning, intellectual curiosity, reflectiveness, creativity, take us to another level in the intellectual realm. If these qualities are not recognized with as much frequency by faculty members, it may mean more

(4) Degree of interest in the study may have differed on the two campuses.

(5) The idea of setting up a list of qualities which would permit one to separate "ideal" students from "non-ideal" may appear to be stereotypic to some faculty members or for some other reason may hold little appeal for them.

(6) Those faculty using more stringent criteria for "ideal" would nominate fewer students than those guided by less stringent criteria.

Qualities of excellence used by faculty members as bases for selection included academic, intellectual, and personal characteristics, leadership, and service. These are presented in Table 5. Faculty members in School I seemed more impressed with academic achievers who worked hard than with independent thinkers who demonstrated intellectual curiosity and were able to integrate learning. This interpretation is based on the fact that 84 per cent of the faculty in School I singled out the former type of student for special commendation, whereas less than half of that number cited the latter qualifications as reasons for their nominations. At School II, although the interest in independent learners (44 per cent) is comparable to that found in School I, this category is not overshadowed by endorsement of the hard-working achievers (56 per cent). Pleasing personality characteristics seemed equally important to both groups of faculty (54 and 56 per cent, respectively, for Schools I and II). In contrast, faculty members at School I were much more interested in qualities of leadership (59 per cent as contrasted with 32 per cent for School II), a dedicated, Christian attitude (54 per cent, School I; 20 per cent, School II), and concern for others (38 per cent; 8 per cent) than faculty members at School II.

What does all of this say about a faculty? Do faculty members prefer diligent, hard work from students at the expense of independent thinking and creativity? It would seem that the former quality demonstrated by students would provide feedback to reassure faculty members concerned about teaching success. However, qualities that have the power to direct students far beyond ordinary, academic accomplishment, e.g., intellectual independence, ability to integrate learning, intellectual curiosity, reflectiveness, creativity, take us to another level in the intellectual realm. If these qualities are not recognized with as much frequency by faculty members, it may mean more

TABLE 5

Qualities of Excellence in "Ideal" Students Singled Out by the Greatest Number of Faculty

Quality or Characteristic	Faculty Members Selecting the Quality			
	School I		School II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1. Academic excellence; hard work; eagerness to learn; interest in work	31	84	14	56
2. Pleasing personality characteristics: well-rounded with diversified interests; enterprising; socially competent; friendly; warm; joyous; vivacious; alert; friendly	20	54	14	56
3. Leadership; contribution to college; institutional loyalty	22	59	8	32
4. Intelligent; able to integrate learning	15	41	13	52
5. Independent thinker; intellectually curious	14	38	11	44
6. Sincere; honest; dedicated; Christian; a woman of convictions	20	54	5	20
7. Responsible; conscientious; cooperative	13	35	6	24
8. Mature; stable	11	30	7	28
9. Creative; talented; reflective	12	32	5	20
10. Concerned about others; sensitive; generous	14	38	2	8

than that they are not present to the same degree as other named traits. It could indicate that faculty members do not place as great a value on these higher-level intellectual characteristics. Perhaps some college faculty do not see that they have a significant role in developing these abilities in students or do not feel qualified or comfortable in dealing with them. Further research into the values of faculty members at these institutions is needed in order to draw firmer conclusions about faculty goals as they relate to student and institutional growth.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

General Description of the Factors

The Principal Components method of factor analysis with Varimax rotation yielded ten factors from the questionnaire items on religious, moral, and intellectual values. Two of the factors related to religious values, five to moral values, and three to intellectual-aesthetic values.

One hundred and sixteen of the 168 value items (Section 2 of the questionnaire) were included in the factors. Fifty-two were dropped from consideration because they did not have sufficiently high factor loadings. Nearly all of the factor leadings in the final factoring ranged from .300 to .829.[1] As indicated in Chapter II, a .3 had been selected as the minimum factor loading for retaining an item in the questionnaire. Many of the loadings were .700 and .800 and were sufficiently high to clearly define the factor. The ten factors, accounting for about 70 per cent of the total variance, possessed items and item groups with communalities ranging from .422 to .806. (See Tables 6 and 7 for the final rotated factor matrices for the ten factors by schools, with commanalities, eigenvalues, and per cent of variance contributed by each factor. Means and standard deviations by schools for the ten factors can be found on Table 8.) Those factors which contributed most to the variance were Factors III (moral values), X (aesthetic values), and I (religious values) for School I, and Factors III (moral values), VIII (intellectual values), and I (religious values) for School II. After the final factoring, the factors were renumbered in accordance with the final determination of common factors across both schools. The direction of scoring for each of the factors is given in Appendix G. A problem arises

---

[1] Loadings for nine of the 116 items were below .3. They were included in the scales because their communalities were satisfactory and because they were meaningful in terms of other items on the factors.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

General Description of the Factors

The Principal Components method of factor analysis with Varimax rotation yielded ten factors from the questionnaire items on religious, moral, and intellectual values. Two of the factors related to religious values, five to moral values, and three to intellectual-aesthetic values.

One hundred and sixteen of the 168 value items (Section 2 of the questionnaire) were included in the factors. Fifty-two were dropped from consideration because they did not have sufficiently high factor loadings. Nearly all of the factor loadings in the final factoring ranged from .300 to .829.[1] As indicated in Chapter II, .3 had been selected as the minimum factor loading for retaining an item in the questionnaire. Many of the loadings were .700 and .800 and were sufficiently high to clearly define the factor. The ten factors, accounting for about 70 per cent of the total variance, possessed items and item groups with communalities ranging from .422 to .806. (See Tables 6 and 7 for the final rotated factor matrices for the ten factors by schools, with communalities, eigenvalues, and per cent of variance contributed by each factor. Means and standard deviations by schools for the ten factors can be found on Table 8.) Those factors which contributed most to the variance were Factors III (moral values), X (aesthetic values), and I (religious values) for School I, and Factors III (moral values), VIII (intellectual values), and I (religious values) for School II. After the final factoring, the factors were renumbered in accordance with the final determination of common factors across both schools. The direction of scoring for each of the factors is given in Appendix G. A problem arises

---

[1] Loadings for nine of the 116 items were below .3. They were included in the scales because their communalities were satisfactory and because they were meaningful in terms of other items on the factors.

Table 6

Rotated Factor Matrix--School I

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
1	-806	167	146	038	091	-034	052	085	-070	-035	806
2	-004	-161	-139	-095	017	188	-078	-462	-230	345	592
3	082	-078	-094	014	-072	107	010	-351	-339	498	587
4	-299	-029	575	-022	047	023	039	036	-070	-103	619
5	-144	-023	726	045	173	-032	087	024	003	-021	645
6	-160	021	415	-138	064	-063	071	160	-106	031	500
7	234	-100	019	-103	-123	020	-117	-101	093	146	547
8	015	032	047	-091	-109	087	-004	-039	013	792	679
9	-096	-055	168	047	-037	-148	588	041	-042	-024	519
10	-020	-066	-030	028	026	-071	-100	-092	-179	043	551
11	-155	135	223	007	166	047	048	014	-063	-109	507
12	-137	645	-029	035	-009	-076	090	084	-058	-092	520
13	-028	010	115	-075	664	-077	-097	051	005	-074	591
14	320	357	229	111	133	051	002	067	-012	-177	584
15	-068	-055	-044	066	088	063	204	072	218	079	564
16	-055	133	116	050	631	009	194	100	069	-073	612
17	-096	-082	351	145	367	207	033	056	-135	-120	536
18	011	198	566	255	-028	-298	-059	118	-111	-048	624
19	-169	040	652	057	184	652	110	049	093	-115	615
20	497	043	-044	-007	-059	-062	-139	-233	-126	163	617
21	773	-141	-158	-046	-001	-070	-058	004	012	-061	705
22	053	-044	-076	019	046	-054	-021	-090	-097	768	664
23	-074	052	342	458	083	040	024	-012	-067	-027	570
24	007	018	088	109	092	072	730	039	065	-113	646
25	-168	150	519	109	-182	-334	040	114	-105	-084	591
26	-109	362	285	172	325	-196	139	-009	-030	-072	537
27	-055	-072	-048	-015	021	021	046	-123	-704	202	637

(Table continued on next page)

Table 6 (continued)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
28	031	-089	-152	101	002	035	035	-478	-261	058	549
29	024	293	346	011	016	-038	065	135	152	-153	565
30	525	007	-047	-069	001	249	-041	001	-075	202	518
31	092	047	-122	014	-025	039	-019	-278	-078	371	536
32	-056	232	453	244	-136	047	057	039	017	011	417
33	-106	664	126	-003	066	046	-072	077	180	-042	555
34	031	273	073	-020	-018	-114	027	176	045	-178	526
35	097	152	-025	062	-018	284	-062	-242	131	125	429
36	059	017	-015	-118	-105	510	010	-008	-383	141	523
37	-091	026	278	045	074	024	063	020	028	-154	548
38	-084	-088	075	075	029	041	-053	-032	055	-015	636
39	-141	027	093	341	-037	017	176	029	060	027	457
40	-093	147	200	396	-049	-071	001	074	-087	-081	422
41	-027	-016	269	650	036	-024	044	126	059	-106	560
42	-027	052	373	396	-094	-131	084	134	093	-049	470
43	-234	010	196	-005	030	028	097	092	049	029	594
44	-296	100	182	132	-050	-245	-012	176	-012	-016	462
45	-446	-025	389	038	164	034	165	-008	076	-011	516
46	-219	015	079	145	046	-109	-078	-064	-039	080	573
47	-245	300	148	-169	151	029	074	105	-183	-056	557
48	046	058	042	010	-050	-007	-074	040	051	039	580
49	-118	-092	584	096	015	083	-009	008	084	-003	487
50	550	052	-269	-089	-033	-075	112	039	-051	060	458
51	[illegible]	-041	-162	-042	046	-020	-021	-021	050	-058	740
52	-002	-055	014	-090	-076	063	-169	-196	001	753	678
53	-195	048	658	128	056	-026	115	012	114	-049	550
54	117	-068	-064	-064	-028	-123	-068	-556	-092	413	627
55	100	011	005	-104	023	-096	-067	-704	-001	009	590
56	004	071	190	-042	013	-018	015	046	018	-639	571

(Table continued on next page)

Table 6 (continued)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
57	108	-023	-094	-006	-035	036	006	-035	-005	025	636
58	317	-001	-065	049	-031	078	069	-079	005	080	600
59	046	044	-002	-091	-070	017	-036	017	-032	-024	723
60	017	175	406	041	-021	-434	-030	231	-119	-043	518
61	-012	-056	-048	-001	-033	-269	-016	-274	084	372	537
62	-006	016	-073	014	-120	-028	005	-425	-209	200	461
63	-026	-048	-089	-030	-008	031	-091	-123	-329	468	494
64	-007	042	293	-139	-074	103	389	090	052	-113	512
65	004	091	063	108	125	-081	028	579	024	-215	541
66	074	-021	-078	213	298	-044	-020	255	-119	-265	460
67	-186	-023	399	404	179	137	-018	114	040	-030	548
68	059	114	117	058	056	-177	042	554	-079	-178	492
69	047	-064	-025	007	-010	021	-738	-043	063	061	593
70	-039	042	104	070	-012	-027	066	217	038	-168	537
71	-200	014	080	231	-126	408	-108	087	-025	011	445
Eigen-values[1]	2.752	1.666	9.985	1.082	1.568	1.310	2.106	1.472	1.246	4.515	
Variance[2]	6.9	4.2	25.0	2.7	3.9	3.3	5.3	3.7	3.1	11.3	

[1] These values are not in descending order because the factors were renumbered in accordance with the final determination of common factors across both schools.

[2] The numbers indicate the percentage of variance contributed by each factor. The ten factors for School I accounted for 69.4 per cent of the variance.

Note.--Decimal points for factor loadings are omitted. The same holds for communalities (h^2).

Table 7

Rotated Factor Matrix--School II

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
1	-799	-076	170	-066	063	126	124	-117	138	023	774
2	-091	161	-075	-123	-055	-213	-056	454	221	-200	622
3	-042	090	-094	-103	085	024	-157	504	511	-012	619
4	-341	006	649	075	-088	085	032	154	049	105	672
5	-210	-003	694	121	089	043	017	033	-175	039	678
6	-113	-040	587	024	-070	087	-001	034	154	013	590
7	292	052	208	015	-139	116	-196	243	256	100	605
8	-072	110	204	-046	015	078	057	489	102	-450	667
9	-032	-056	134	-070	034	-031	421	-022	097	150	538
10	043	108	-072	-173	182	-020	-112	131	104	100	589
11	-219	-040	201	216	176	-005	234	-118	-023	-105	468
12	-025	-530	-047	091	022	168	132	-097	099	182	588
13	017	-060	108	077	711	-072	048	-136	021	-008	579
14	187	-156	040	113	-040	050	378	-307	030	053	448
15	-001	087	031	-093	085	005	328	-047	-005	-008	499
16	-144	-124	111	112	092	-005	059	-015	063	055	599
17	-056	-034	224	020	136	023	007	034	061	086	592
18	025	-113	346	069	116	507	-013	-012	124	-019	610
19	-088	-054	708	087	131	037	005	-028	-018	-023	686
20	424	086	097	-054	175	044	-179	456	089	063	606
21	784	096	-155	-065	003	-098	133	-039	-066	036	723
22	010	-090	183	-109	-068	-003	-009	376	112	-644	684
23	-024	-019	347	203	035	214	055	006	059	-047	619
24	161	-038	283	155	206	089	573	-132	192	-104	633
25	-239	-052	296	047	-129	702	096	-051	020	072	689
26	-075	-073	447	066	363	278	103	-108	059	-104	675
27	-009	-013	056	-103	025	-004	-062	168	777	-053	681
28	030	008	023	-032	057	-036	008	188	-104	-134	557
29	173	-168	424	-092	-133	219	182	-193	036	018	546

(Table continued on next page)

Table 7 (continued)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
30	481	054	-014	-085	020	-080	-255	081	069	-364	570
31	-009	-037	-052	008	-041	-093	-179	583	152	-077	451
32	-081	082	152	089	041	166	084	095	163	-060	563
33	-059	-649	116	-093	105	096	089	-098	-031	-039	548
34	030	-001	042	135	006	081	-042	-082	-067	008	535
35	028	032	-029	029	062	-069	-601	158	206	-039	516
36	102	-126	-080	-028	-024	025	-025	-045	009	-144	653
37	-130	065	218	-087	-024	290	-158	151	-208	266	553
38	-080	-009	001	-063	139	100	-107	-014	-119	-079	612
39	-220	-265	068	-035	-084	-212	227	-035	-125	-044	512
40	-049	-001	134	669	061	-014	-025	-057	-006	034	543
41	-027	026	075	679	-003	165	038	117	-132	112	628
42	-018	-279	112	147	-078	148	039	-109	-022	096	554
43	-070	033	110	001	077	042	-120	-036	071	084	538
44	-379	-153	112	122	078	313	-011	174	054	-061	556
45	-426	010	142	122	092	-024	072	056	073	-023	582
46	-205	-002	034	-086	399	065	-001	328	-002	241	552
47	-211	-404	082	010	316	-005	-112	153	018	-052	532
48	007	005	-044	-018	-061	144	-067	062	043	050	630
49	-096	125	282	-047	032	-071	-021	021	001	030	531
50	622	-114	-216	086	-099	012	-033	-140	101	-032	559
51	829	-050	-012	-102	026	-045	148	-092	040	059	780
52	-021	-014	129	-127	054	018	003	601	084	-467	689
53	-157	-053	470	105	271	192	-017	028	-035	-051	563
54	066	041	094	-041	-042	021	-065	775	-007	-045	668
55	102	121	126	-178	-046	047	-017	402	-079	180	632
56	084	-126	314	033	-086	058	043	-159	056	527	636
57	018	113	-048	059	108	-011	-078	-059	-054	-044	477
58	391	-071	076	128	179	-153	-382	249	-024	-036	535
59	156	-036	-084	072	122	078	032	-107	-069	-016	575
60	-089	-037	-013	053	-001	756	-007	-037	-084	-012	655

(Table continued on next page)

Table 7 (continued

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	h^2
61	-015	-024	008	023	-080	032	003	636	-064	046	465
62	-011	-092	-102	115	182	118	-108	364	202	-092	462
63	-091	192	-090	100	-119	-150	039	428	403	-236	577
64	-038	028	066	192	058	059	079	-142	-076	-031	507
65	108	-020	070	-007	-093	025	094	-545	-053	123	531
66	089	070	193	026	-200	-059	-021	-429	-178	-066	591
67	-044	-096	253	142	-216	080	142	026	023	047	571
68	-028	-065	011	062	018	249	-016	-362	008	-192	494
69	017	071	087	-006	-027	076	-651	027	077	005	541
70	024	-162	066	326	069	056	128	-211	-038	-035	522
71	-180	506	031	-123	160	106	-070	-086	191	-065	648
Eigen-values[1]	3.136	2.049	7.059	1.138	1.694	1.690	1.208	6.299	1.400	1.327	
Variance[2]	7.5	4.9	16.9	2.7	4.1	4.1	2.9	15.1	3.4	3.2	

[1] These values are not in descending order because the factors were renumbered in accordance with the final determination of common factors across both schools.

[2] The numbers indicate the percentage of variance contributed by each factor. The ten factors for School II accounted for 68.8 per cent of the total common variance.

Note.--Decimal points for factor loadings are omitted. The same holds for communalities (h^2).

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Size for Factors by Schools

Factor		School I	School II	Total
I	Mn[1]	82.9	83.8	83.2
	SD	17.61	17.87	17.71
	N	744	411	1155
II	Mn	10.5	10.7	10.6
	SD	2.49	2.69	2.56
	N	745	411	1156
III	Mn	64.5	64.1	64.3
	SD	9.07	9.80	9.45
	N	745	411	1156
IV	Mn	19.7	19.8	19.8
	SD	3.85	2.71	3.49
	N	745	411	1156
V	Mn	9.4	9.5	9.4
	SD	1.45	1.73	1.56
	N	745	411	1156
VI	Mn	8.4	8.3	8.3
	SD	3.70	2.10	3.23
	N	745	411	1156
VII	Mn[2]	11.7	11.8	11.7
	SD	2.19	2.14	2.20
	N	744	411	1155
VIII	Mn[3]	25.7	22.5	24.5
	SD	6.80	7.06	7.05
	N	745	411	1156
IX	Mn	8.1	6.9	7.7
	SD	2.80	3.10	3.37
	N	744	411	1155
X	Mn	17.4	14.3	16.3
	SD	6.49	5.87	6.44
	N	745	411	1156

[1] Constant of seventy was added to make all values positive.

[2] Constant of five was added to make all values positive.

[3] Constant of ten was added to make all values positive.

with a discussion of specific questions or statements from the questionnaire because of the unreliability of single items. Such an approach will, nonetheless, be undertaken to enable the reader to have a better understanding of the factors and to provide focus for a discussion of the scales. Those factors which contributed most to the variance will be presented first.

Factor I: Religious Practices and Attitudes.

There were 39 items (4 item groups) in this factor. Of these, 27 were in clusters that had factor loadings between .773 and .829. Communalities for these ranged from .705 to .806. Table 9 lists the questionnaire items which grouped with each factor, the loadings and the communalities. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix D. Factor I contributed 6.9 per cent to the total variance for School I, 7.5 per cent for School II. A low score indicates that a person is very religious; a high score is at the irreligious end of the continuum.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for the two schools on all the variables of the study by scoring the schools numerically with a coding of zero (0) and one (1). This is equivalent to a point-biserial correlation. No significant inter-school differences in scores on Factor I were found. Two major types of items emerged: those concerned with the God relationship and Christian development and those relating to religious practices and the holding of a traditional Catholic view on certain issues. Tables 10 and 11 show the percentage responses to selected items from the factor for the total sample. The selection was made on the basis of items which best defined the factor.

The fact that items measuring religious practices (Table 11) related highly to items on Table 10 involving a more committed view of religion (Allen and Spilka, 1967) seems to indicate that, in the sample, frequency of religious practice and deeper measures of religiosity are found together. Religious practice could be superficially related to religiosity, particularly in a highly structured denomination which places many religious obligations on its members. In the present study there is evidence that those who have high scores on religious practices are those who are also interested in personal Christian development and a deeper God relationship.

In Table 10, four-fifths or more of the respondents gave the more religious response to all of the selected items except Items 18, 39, and 42. Perhaps Items 39 ("I love God but I have to admit

TABLE 9

Factor Loadings and Communalities by Schools for the Ten Factors

Factor	Variable	Item No.	Factor Loading Sch. I	Factor Loading Sch. II	h^2 Sch. I	h^2 Sch. II
I (39 items)	51	130, 124, 164, 161, 153, 141, 167	825	829	740	780
	1	9, 34, 41, 42, 35, 39, 18, 27, 6, 31, 16, 22, 20, 46	-806	-799	806	744
	21	114, 115, 109, 103, 78, 54	773	784	705	723
	50	118	550	622	458	559
	30	53	525	481	518	570
	20	97, 98, 60, 90, 100, 106, 64	497	424	617	606
	45	99	-446	-426	516	582
	58	121	317	391	600	535
	44	94	-296	-379	462	556
II	33	61	664	-649	555	548
(4 items)	12	25	645	-530	520	588
	47	104	300	-404	557	532
	14	43	357	-156	584	448

(Table continued on next page)

TABLE 9 (continued)

Factor	Variable	Item No.	Factor Loading Sch. I	Factor Loading Sch. II	h^2 Sch. I	h^2 Sch. II
III	5	2, 4, 29, 11	726	694	645	678
(23 items)	19	71, 75, 79, 80, 81	652	708	615	686
	4	14, 38, 32	575	649	619	672
	53	132, 123, 126	658	470	550	563
	6	23, 36	415	587	500	590
	18	96, 112, 113, 62, 108	566	346	624	610
	49	116	584	282	487	531
IV	41	82	650	679	560	628
(6 items)	40	77	396	669	422	543
	23	84, 93	458	203	570	619
	42	83	396	147	470	554
	67	149	404	142	548	571
V	13	30	664	711	591	579
(3 items)	26	55, 68	325	363	537	675
VI	60	129	-434	756	518	655
(3 items)	25	59, 67	-334	702	591	689

(Table continued on next page)

TABLE 9 (continued)

Factor	Variable	Item No.	Factor Loading Sch. I	Factor Loading Sch. II	h^2 Sch. I	h^2 Sch. II
VII	69	157	-738	-651	593	541
(4 items)	24	50, 57	730	573	646	633
	9	3	588	421	519	538
VIII	54	163, 144, 154	-556	775	637	668
(16 items)	55	168, 156, 165	-704	402	590	632
	65	146	579	-545	541	531
	68	151	554	-362	492	494
	2	24, 37, 44, 10	-462	454	592	622
	61	135	-274	636	537	465
	31	56	-278	583	536	583
	62	138	-425	364	461	463
	66	148	255	-429	460	591
IX	27	85, 111	-704	777	637	681
(6 items)	3	8, 17, 1	-339	511	587	619
	63	142	-329	403	494	577
X	22	87, 95, 119	768	-644	664	684
(12 items)	52	127, 155, 136, 125	753	-467	677	689

(Table continued on next page)

TABLE 9 (continued)

Factor	Variable	Item No.	Factor Loading		h^2	
			Sch. I	Sch. II	Sch. I	Sch. II
	8	26, 15	792	-450	679	669
	56	150, 131, 158	-639	527	571	636

Note--The following 29 items in the final factoring did not have sufficiently high loadings to be included in any of the ten factors: 5, 12, 33, 45, 47, 48, 49, 58, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 95, 101, 110, 119, 120, 128, 137, 145, 159, 166.

TABLE 10

Percentage Response to Selected Items[1] from Factor I: Items on Relationship with God and Christian Development
(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Positive Responses	Negative Responses
41	I am filled with a sense of gratitude for all God has done for me.	88	12
34	I turn to God for help when I have a difficult decision to make or a difficult task to perform.	86	14
39[2]	I love God but I have to admit that I rarely give Him a thought as I go about my daily tasks.	43	57
42[2]	I have not given much thought to my personal involvement with Christ.	38	62
97	I find myself pondering over what it means to be a Christian and what kind of Christian I am.	84	16
35	I have a strong desire for spiritual growth and a deepening of my religious convictions.	81	19
60	I enjoy becoming involved in discussions about religion.	79	21
18	I think I would enjoy telling others about God and His love for us.	62	38
98	I would like to be in contact with a priest or religious with whom I could discuss certain aspects of my life as a Christian.	82	18

[1] Items selected were those which best defined the factor. See Table 9 for a list of all the items for Factor I.

[2] Factor loading for this item is in the opposite direction from loadings on other items.

Table 11

Percentage Response to Selected Items[1] from Factor I: Religious Practices and Traditional Catholic View
(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[2] A	B	C
109	I pray in my own words: A) Daily/several times a week; B) Weekly/occasionally; C) Seldom	74	22	4
115	I say morning and night prayers: A) Regularly/frequently; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	53	37	10
124	If it were left to me completely, and the Church made no regulations or recommendations concerning attendance at Church, I would probably attend religious services: A) More than weekly/weekly; B) Once a month; C) Once or twice a year/never or almost never	81	14	5
114	I say the rosary: A) Daily/frequently; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	12	65	23
130	It is important to me to make special sacrifices during Lent. A) Very much/somewhat; B) Not so important; C) Not at all	56	32	12
164	If you should ever marry, how important is it to you that your marriage should be witnessed by a priest? A) Very important; B) Somewhat important; C) Not very important/not important	85	10	5
153	Assuming that the quality of education is comparable to other schools in the community, how important is it to you that your children attend a Catholic school? A) Very/rather important; B) Not too important; C) Not at all important	73	18	9

[1] Items selected were those which best defined the factor. See Table 9 for a list of all the items for Factor I.

[2] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

that I rarely give Him a thought as I go about my daily tasks.") and 42 ("I have not given much thought to my personal involvement with Christ.") were less susceptible to response set, because of the reverse direction in the wording of the item. Acceptance of Item 18 ("I think I would enjoy telling others about God and His love for us.") would require initiative in religious matters which might not be typical of most college students.

Items 42 (personal involvement with Christ) and 97 ("I find myself pondering over what it means to be a Christian and what kind of Christian I am.") appear to be quite similar to each other in content, but there was a difference of 22 percentage points between the pro-religious responses on the two items, with greater endorsement being given to Item 97. Item 97 may be more open to acquiescence response set than Item 42. An alternative possibility relates to a subtle distinction between the two items which is not immediately apparent. Item 42 deals with personal involvement with Christ, which is one aspect of Christianity, and perhaps not the first one to which students are drawn. Item 97 deals with Christianity more generally and could appear, to students, to refer to the social aspects of the term, with which they would be more familiar.

Table 11 contains items describing religious practices and some statements which would very likely receive endorsement from traditional Catholics. Two practices, that of saying morning and night prayers and the idea of making Lenten sacrifices, are almost as likely to be disregarded as practiced. The rosary as a form of prayer likewise does not hold much appeal for this generation of students. Praying in their own words is much more popular. Interestingly enough, more than four-fifths claim that they would voluntarily attend Church services as often as they do now under obligation.

At a time in the history of the Church when there is much discussion of the value of Catholic parochial schools, three-fourths of the students in the sample adopted the more traditional Catholic viewpoint of electing the Church schools for their children. The strong preference for marriage by a priest is not surprising, since this is required for a practicing Catholic and has not been subjected to the rigorous kind of questioning that other Church laws have encountered.

Factor III: Moral Values (Honesty)

There were 23 items and 6 item groups in the factor. For fifteen of these, factor loadings ranged from .470 to .726 with communalities from .550 to .686. Table 9 lists the questionnaire items which loaded on Factor III, as well as the factor loadings and communalities. Items treat principally of dishonesty in financial matters, in the use of what belongs to another, and in self-representation. Inter-school differences were again negligible. Factor III accounted for 25.0 per cent of the total variance for School I, 16.9 per cent for School II. This was also the first factor to emerge for both schools before the factors were renumbered. A low score on the factor indicates dishonesty. Table 12 gives percentages for various responses for selected items from the factor.

The strong disagreement with the first three items (75, 2, and 4: cheating on income tax, telephone credit cards, and accident insurance) on Table 12 could be related to the distance of most students from experience with the matters described, particularly with income tax and insurance. On the other hand, the opportunity to sneak into a movie without paying (Item 29) is more likely to be close to the experience of students. This may be why many of them indicated that they would probably indulge in the behavior. Another difference between Item 29 (sneaking into a movie) and the first three items on Table 12 (Items 75, 2, and 4) is that the former asks the student what she would actually do in the situation, whereas the latter ask her to judge the rightness or wrongness of the behaviors for other people. If she were requested to indicate whether it was all right for people to sneak into movies without paying, she might not think that it is justified but still be willing to do it.

On Item 96 ("I find myself exaggerating or distorting a story in order to make myself appear better than I am."), about one-third of the students responded that they do this "occasionally;" about one-half do it "seldom." The reverse is true for the "occasionally" and "seldom" responses for Item 112 ("I make excuses for my behavior when someone indicates that he is disappointed in me."). The same reversal of percentages occurs for the "frequently" and "never" responses for the two items. Perhaps what is indicated is either that students are more likely to make excuses to explain disappointing personal behavior than to falsely enhance their image by distorting information about themselves or that the former is easier to admit.

TABLE 12

Percentage Reponse to Selected Items[1] from Factor III: Moral Values

(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[2] A	Responses[2] B	Responses[2] C
75	If the government continues to make heavy income tax demands on people, they are somewhat justified in paying less than the amount due. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	16	84	--
2	The telephone company makes enough money that it doesn't bother me if some people charge long distance calls to non-existent credit cards. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	11	89	--
4	After an auto accident it is all right to ask an insurance company for more money than you deserve. A) Stronly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	6	94	--
29	If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. A) Very likely/possibly I would; B) It is unlikely that I would do it. /I know I would not do it.	33	67	--
132[3]	If you were driving in another state and got a ticket for parking just a few minutes overtime while getting your lunch, would you bother to pay the fine? A) Definitely/probably yes; B) Probably no/definitely not	72	28	--
113	I use other people's things without their permission. A) Regularly; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	1	67	32

(Table continued on next page)

TABLE 12 (continued)

Item Number	Description	Responses[2]		
		A	B	C
96	I find myself exaggerating or distorting a story in order to make myself appear better than I am. A) Frequently; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	5	85	10
112	I make excuses for my behavior when someone indicates that he is disappointed in me. A) Frequently; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	10	85	5

[1] Items selected were those which best defined the factor. See Table 9 for a list of all the items for Factor III.

[2] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

[3] Factor loading for this item is in the opposite direction from other items on this table.

Factor VIII: Intellectual Values

There were 16 items, comprising 3 item groups and 6 single items, in the factor. Of these, 11 had factor loadings that ranged from .402 to .775. Communalities ranged from .531 to .668. Table 9 provides the questionnaire items in Factor VIII and their factor loadings and communalities.

Hypothesis 4, that no inter-school differences in values held by students in the two colleges would be found, was not supported. Although the differences were statistically significant, conceptually these variations were small (r = -.216). (Appendix H lists significant intercorrelations among relevant variables for the study in matrix form.) School II had lower scores on intellectual values than School I. (A low score indicates strong intellectual values.) Likewise the College Entrance Examination Board(SAT) scores and grade point averages were higher for School II than for School I. If these variables were held constant, the differences between schools on Factor VIII might disappear. It is also possible that certain changes in administrative practices and curricular programs were attracting students with higher ability scores to School II.

Table 13 gives percentage scores by schools for selected items from Factor VIII. Items 37 ("I can easily become absorbed in readings recommended by a professor for 'those who wish to pursue the matter further.'") and 56 ("I sometimes wish that a professor would suggest an evening session to discuss further a topic which came up in class.") are similar in the sense that they both entail pursuit of intellectual matters beyond the classroom. Informal discussions with a professor (Item 56) were more appealing to the students than readings recommended by him (Item 37). There were no observable inter-school differences in responses to Item 56, but Item 37 (recommended readings), with 13 percentage points separating the two groups, is one of the items in the factor which contributed to the observed significant inter-school variation.

A similar contrast, in the same direction, is noted for Item 44 ("As a youngster I acquired a strong interest in intellectual and aesthetic matters."). Such emphasis on intellectual and aesthetic matters acquired in the home at an early age should certainly relate to the development of such interests in college. The students who responded positively to Item 44 had more desirable scores on Factors VIII, IX (intellectual values), and X (aesthetic values) than those who answered the item negatively.

Table 13

Percentage Response by Schools to Selected Items[1] from Factor VIII: Intellectual Values

Item Number	Description	Positive Responses		Negative Responses	
		School I (N=745)	School II (N=411)	School I (N=745)	School II (N=411)
37	I can easily become absorbed in readings recommended by a professor for "those who wish to pursue the matter further."	42	55	58	45
44	As a youngster I acquired a strong interest in intellectual and aesthetic matters.	31	45	69	55
56	I sometimes wish that a professor would suggest an evening session to discuss further a topic which came up in class.	68	70	32	30
156	Do you enjoy solving problems of the type found in geometry, philosophy?	63	73	37	27
163	Do you like to discuss philosophical problems?	75	84	25	16
168	Do you like to solve "brain teasers?"	69	76	31	24
146	Do you like assignments which require you to draw your own conclusions from some data or body of facts?	72	78	28	22
151	Do you prefer to have a principle or theory explained to you, rather than studying it out for yourself?	77	68	23	32
154	Do you analyze new ideas which you hear or read about to see if they fit in with your own point of view?	83	87	17	13
10[2]	I have a tendency to choose "snap courses" and avoid tough ones when I have a choice in the matter.	24	18	76	82

---

[1] Items selected were those which best defined the factor. See Table 9 for a list of all the items for Factor VIII.

[2] Factor loading for this item is in the opposite direction from loadings on other items.

A study of the last five items on Table 13 suggests an interesting analysis. Responding positively to the solving of "brain teasers" (Item 168), drawing conclusions from data (Item 146), analyzing new ideas to see if they fit in with a person's point of view (Item 154), and refraining from choosing "snap courses" (Item 10) would seem to give a person quite a few intellectual points. Three-fourths to four-fifths of the subjects responded to the items in this way. But almost the same number indicated that they would prefer to have a principle or theory explained to them than to study it out for themselves (Item 151). To have chosen to study it out for themselves would indicate a kind of initiative that is more in keeping with responses to the other items noted above. However, perhaps the American value of efficiency would prompt many students to elect having a principle or theory explained to them rather than the other alternative offered. In addition, the prevalence of the lectur method in college could have conditioned students to listening to explanations, rather than using a more inductive approach. One might also conjecture that the responses to Items 10, 146, 154, and 168 could be colored by a strong social desirability response tendency.

Factor X: Aesthetic Values

There were 12 items and four item groups in this factor with loadings from -.450 to .792 and communalities ranging from .571 to .689 (see Table 6). Factor X contributed 11.3 per cent to the total variance for School I, 3.2 per cent for School II. Although on practical grounds the inter-school differences found were small (r = -.224), they were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence, thus lending further support to the rejection of Hypothesis 4 discussed above. School II had twice as many fine arts majors as School I, and this might have contributed to the greater identification with aesthetic values for School II. A low score on the factor is equivalent to high aesthetic values.

Table 14 gives percentage scores by schools for selected items from Factor I.

Some of the greatest inter-school differences seem due to the music appreciation items (Items 95, 131, and 150) and to the option between a dance or a party and a play (Item 158). The considerable interest in the arts expressed at both institutions should be an encouragement and incentive to those planning programs in these areas.

Table 14

Percentage Response by Schools to Selected Items[1] from Factor X: Aesthetic Values

Item Number	Description	Positive Responses School I (N=745)	Positive Responses School II (N=411)	Negative Responses School I (N=745)	Negative Responses School II (N=411)
87	Please indicate the degree of your interest in cultural affairs.	83	90	17	10
119	More than once I've dreamed about having enough time and talent to paint or sculpture.	63	72	37	28
155	How much do you enjoy reading poetry?	74	82	26	18
136	Have you ever tried your hand at writing poetry, aside from assignments in this area?	47	47	53	53
26	Courses in literature and poetry have been as satisfying to me as most other subjects.	69	72	31	28
95	I'd like to spend an evening attending a symphony concert.	61	77	39	23
131	I enjoy hearing a great singer in an opera.	53	64	47	36
150[2]	Do you prefer popular to classical music?	75	63	25	37
158[2]	Would you prefer to go to a dance or party than a play?	82	66	18	34

[1] Items selected were those which best defined the factor. See Table 9 for a list of all the items for Factor X.

[2] Factor loading for this item is in the opposite direction from loadings on other items.

Factor II: Consensual Religiosity

Tendencies to "use" religion and believe in a shallow manner are implied in the term "consensual" (Allen and Spilka, 1967). Some magic mentality is also present on the scale. There were only four items on the factor. Loadings ranged from -.156 to .664 and communalities went from .448 to .588. Table 9 lists these questionnaire items as well as the factor loadings and communalities. Inter-school differences were negligible. Factor II accounted for 4.2 per cent of the total common variance for School I, 4.9 per cent for School II. Table 15 gives percentage scores for the subjects on the factor. A low factor score indicates consensual religiosity. It should be noted that Factor II correlates negatively with Factor I (religious practices, God relationship, and Christian development.

Two-fifths of the students agree with Item 25 ("When I sin, the thought of having to tell it in confession is what bothers me most."). The implication of this response is that sinning is not of as great concern as having to admit to it. True sorrow for the offense would lead one to disagree with the statement. However, other reasons could also produce the "disagree" response. For example, some students could feel that living with the guilt is the worst part of sinning.

Item 13 in Section I of WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK assesses frequency of confession. Two-thirds of the students said they used this sacrament every two months or less often. Among those who use it infrequently, there would be those who would disagree with Item 25 because the thought of having to confess is not uppermost in their minds. On the other hand, some of the infrequent users of the sacrament might agree that the worst part of sinning is having to go to confession and therefore solve the problem for themselves by staying away from it. It would seem, then, that the mixture of motives possibly present in the "disagree" response to Item 25 precludes our determining whether more than two-fifths of the sample answered it in a consensually religious manner.

The other three items in the factor relate to praying. "Never known to fail" prayers (Item 43), indicative of a magic mentality about prayer, do not appeal to the group. (Eighty-one per cent rejected the item; almost one-half of this number strongly objected to the item.) Very few students (10 per cent) felt that they shifted up and down in their conviction that God

TABLE 15

Percentage Response to Items from Factor II: Consensual Religiosity
(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[1] A	B	C
61	I usually find myself praying intensely only in times of crisis or special need. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	62	38	--
25	When I sin, the thought of having to tell it in confession is what bothers me most. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	38	62	--
43	I like to use prayers which are reportedly "never known to fail." A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	19	81	--
100	I shift up and down in my conviction that God will hear my prayers. A) Often; B) Occasionally/seldom; C) Never	10	56	34

---

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

hears prayers (Item 104). Slightly more than half did so occasionally or seldom. Another one-third have never had a problem in this regard. Both of these items place the majority of the respondents closer to committed than consensual religiosity. Some inconsistency seems to be introduced into the factor with Item 61 ("I usually find myself praying intensely only in times of crisis or special need."). Sixty-two per cent agree with the item, the consensual response. The percentages for this variable are directly the reverse of those for Item 25 (sinning and confessing it). Additional items to strengthen this factor may shed light on some of the inconsistencies found with this sample.

Factor IV: Moral Values (Cheating on Examinations and Stealing)

Six items (1 item group and 4 single items) in the factor possess loadings ranging from .142 to .679. Communalities ranged from .422 to .628. Table 9 lists the questionnaire items which grouped with the factor, the loadings, and the communalities. Factor IV contributed 2.7 per cent to the total variance for both schools. A low score on the factor indicates tendencies toward cheating and stealing. Table 16 gives percentage scores for the factor items.

Some interesting comparisons with previous research can be made on attitudes toward and incidence of cheating for the two campuses in the present study. Eighty per cent of the students in the two Catholic women's colleges (this research) viewed cheating as seriously wrong (Item 149). The same percentages were found for non-religious students by Goldsen, et al. (1960) and for students on two secular campuses by McNamara (1963). However, Goldsen's religious students (believers who attend Church services regularly) condemned the behavior to a greater extent (92 per cent), while McNamara's Catholic college sample took a lighter view of it (57 per cent). On the question of admission of cheating, the picture changes somewhat. Sixty-one per cent of the sample in the present study indicated that they have cheated on examinations (Item 82). This is comparable to the number at the Catholic universities in McNamara's study who admit to it (53 per cent) but much more frequent than the incidence found in Goldsen's study (37 per cent) and in McNamara's secular campus sample (28 per cent). McNamara concluded, on the basis of his finding of greater admission of cheating on the Catholic campuses, that these students tolerate the behavior more than do those on the secular campuses. Such a statement may well go beyond the data. However, the Goldsen statistic of greater tendency in

TABLE 16

Percentage Response to Items from Factor IV: Moral Values (Cheating; Stealing)

(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[1] A	B	C
77	Most college students would cheat on an exam if they were sure of not being caught. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	37	63	--
149	How do you feel about helping another student cheat on an exam? A) It is all right; B) It is wrong but not seriously; C) Seriously/very seriously wrong	1	19	80
82	Indicate as frankly as you can how often you have cheated in exams. A) Frequently/occasionally; B) Seldom; C) Never	14	47	39
83	Indicate as frankly as you can how often you have copied term papers or assignments or handed in a class report that was not your own work. A) Frequently/occasionally; B) Seldom; C) Never	10	32	58
84	Indicate as frankly as you can how often you have taken things which did not belong to you. A) Frequently/occasionally; B) Seldom; C) Never	6	29	65
93	From time to time in my life, I have taken little things from stores or from people's rooms. A) Frequently/occasionally; B) Seldom; C) Never	5	16	79

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

the religious sample to justify cheating when it is socially supported (87 per cent in contrast to 75 per cent) seems congruent with greater acceptance of cheating in the Catholic institutions. A similar direction in pattern is observed for those who do not admit to having cheated: 39 per cent for the present study, 44 per cent in McNamara's Catholic campus sample, 72 per cent in his secular university sample, and 61 per cent in Goldsen's 1952 study. Cheating, then, could be viewed as a less serious offense by students on Catholic campuses or, perhaps because of the role religion plays in their personal lives, they might be more willing to admit such tendencies.

Factor V: Moral Values (Jealousy, Revenge)

Three items (1 item group and 1 single item) in the factor possessed loadings from .325 to .711 and communalities ranging from .537 to .675 (See Table 9). Inter-school differences were negligible. Factor V contributed 3.9 per cent to the total variance for School I and 4.1 per cent for School II. A low score indicates that a person is jealous or eager to seek revenge. Table 17 shows percentage responses to the three items in the factor for the total sample.

Jealousy and revenge, as measured by the three items in Factor V, do not seem to be major problems on the two campuses. Less than one-fifth of the sample think that "People who have everything ought to be knocked down a peg or two occasionally" (Item 30). Item 55, "When someone does me a wrong, I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing," was endorsed by one-eighth of the group. About the same small percentage agreed with Item 68 ("If someone who hurt me deeply met with some misfortune later, I would secretly be glad"). In each of these items, more than four-fifths of the students have chosen the less aggressive moral position.

Factor VI: Moral Values ("Catty," Scandalous, Risque Stories)

There were three items (1 item and 1 item group) in the factor with factor loadings ranging from -.334 to .756 and communalities from .518 to .689 (See Table 9). Inter-school differences were negligible. Factor VI accounted for 3.3 per cent of the total variance for School I, 4.1 per cent for School II. A low score is equivalent to high interest in "catty," scandalous, and risque stories. Table 18 gives percentage scores for the three items for the total sample.

TABLE 17

Percentage Response to Items from Factor V: Moral Values (Jealousy; Revenge)

(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[1] A	Responses[1] B
30	People who have everything ought to be knocked down a peg or two occasionally. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree/ strongly disagree	18	82
55	When someone does me a wrong, I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing. A) Strongly agree/ agree; B) Disagree/strongly disagree	12	88
68	If someone who hurt me deeply met with some misfortune later, I would secretly be glad. A) True/probably true; B) Probably false/false	14	86

---

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

TABLE 18

Percentage Response to Items from Factor VI:
Moral Values ("Catty," Risque, Scandalous Stories)
(N = 1156)

Item Number	Description	Responses[1] A	B	C
129	I like to tell interesting stories about other people, even if they are a little on the "catty" side. A) Very much/sometimes; B) Not usually; C) Not at all	36	47	17
59	If someone is telling a slightly scandalous story about someone I know, I certainly wouldn't want to miss it. A) Very true/probably true; B) I wouldn't care if I heard it or not; C) I would prefer not to hear it	37	39	24
67	I listen to risque stories if I get a chance. A) True/tends to be true; B) Tends to be false; C) False	39	40	21

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

About one-third to two-fifths of the students from the two colleges state that they like to tell 'catty stories and listen to scandalous and risque ones. It is difficult to judge how much of the response is related to morality and what part is based on curiosity or the lack of it.

Factor VII: Moral Values (Racial Prejudice)

There were four items (1 item group and 2 single items) in the factor. Factor loadings ranged from .421 to -.738. Communalities ranged from .519 to .646 (See Table 9). Inter-school differences were negligible. Factor VII accounted for 5.3 per cent of the total common variance for School I and 2.9 per cent for School II. A low score on the factor relates to a high prejudice score. Table 19 gives percentage scores for the four items for the total sample.

Ninety-one per cent of the students would object to laws against interracial marriage (Item 50), but only 80 per cent were opposed to allowing white people to vote on whether black people should be allowed to move into the neighborhood (Item 57). The discrepancy here may relate to the fact that an individual responding to the two items might consider interracial marriage personally more remote than integrated neighborhoods. Item 157 ("If a Negro with the same income and education as you were going to move into your block, how would you probably react?") also relates to integrated housing. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they would wait until they met the new neighbor before they formed an opinion about him. This seems to be the response which is least subject to prejudice. When this percentage is combined with the 15 per cent who indicated that they would look forward to the experience, it corresponds to the number who object to allowing "whites" to vote before "blacks" may inhabit a neighborhood. Item 3 ("A student should feel free to request that no Negro be assigned to be her roommate.") has almost two-thirds of the students in agreement with it. Lack of congruence with the other prejudice items may stem from an objection to having anyone assigned as a roommate when it is customary for upperclassmen on the two campuses to choose those with whom they will room. It might also be that the terms of the item could be more threatening than the other statements to a person who is still trying to deal with some feelings of racial prejudice.

TABLE 19

Percentage Response to Items from Factor VII: Moral Values (Prejudice)

(N = 1155)

Item Number	Description	Responses[1] A	B	C
50	There should be laws against marriage between persons of different races. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree; C) Strongly disagree	9	49	42
57	Negro families should not be allowed to move into all-white areas without the residents' consent. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree; C) Strongly disagree	19	45	36
157	If a Negro with the same income and education as you were going to move into your block, how would you probably react? A) I would look forward to it; B) I wouldn't know until I met him; C) I would be somewhat apprehensive/I would be upset by it	15	69	16
3	A student should feel free to request that no Negro be assigned to be her roommate. A) Strongly agree; B) Agree; C) Disagree/strongly disagree	13	52	35

---

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

Factor IX: Intellectual Values (World Affairs and Reading Interest)

There were six items (2 item groups and 1 single item) in the factor with factor loadings ranging from -.329 to .777. Communalities ranged from .587 to .681 (See Table 9). School II had significantly lower scores on the factor (beyond the .01 level of confidence). A low score on the factor indicates high interest in world affairs and serious reading. On the basis of this finding, together with inter-school differences found on Factors VIII and X, Hypothesis 4, postulating no inter-school differences, was rejected. Factor IX accounted for 3.1 per cent of the total variance for School I and 3.4 per cent for School II. Table 20 gives percentage scores for the six items for the total sample.

About one-third of the sample is extremely interested in world affairs (Item 85), yet the great majority of the students would assent to some degree of interest. Seventy-five and 86 per cent respectively for Schools I and II indicated that they enjoy attending lectures or intellectual discussions. However, when students were asked in Section 1 of the questionnaire how often in the last year or so they had attended a public lecture, 48 per cent and 46 per cent (Schools I and II) answered never; 33 per cent at each school claimed they had done so once or twice; 19 per cent and 22 per cent indicated three or more times. Here is another example of a gap between what is valued and what is actually done. Most of the students have little time for serious reading (Item 142), and about 10 per cent admit that they would not enjoy it even if they had the time.

Summary of the Discussion of the Ten Factors

Students on the two campuses give heavy endorsement to items which seem to reflect values of the institutional church, such as regular attendance at church services, intention to send their children to Catholic schools, and desire to have their marriages witnessed by priests. Other items which seem to have strong appeal are praying in their own words, reflecting on what it means to be a Christian, participating in religious discussions, and desiring to deepen their religious convictions. In contrast to this pro-religious picture, almost two-thirds feel that they pray intensely only in times of crisis.

Considerable disapproval of such forms of dishonesty as using phony telephone credit card numbers, cheating on income tax, attempting to claim more money than is deserved from an insurance company, and cheating on exams exists. There

Table 20

Percentage Response to Items from Factor IX: Intellectual Values (World Affairs and Reading Interest)
(N = 745, School I; N = 411, School II)

Item Number		"A" Responses[1]		"B" Responses[1]		"C" Responses[1]	
		Sch. I	Sch. II	Sch. I	Sch. II	Sch. I	Sch. II
85	Please indicate the degree of your interest in international and world affairs. A) Much; B) Some; C) Little/none	33	41	53	46	14	13
1	As a rule I enjoy attending lectures or intellectual discussions. A) Strongly agree; B) Agree; C) Disagree/strongly disagree	14	26	60	59	26	15
8[2]	I seldom discuss the causes and possible solutions of social, political, economic, or international problems. A) Strongly agree/agree; B) Disagree; C) Strongly disagree	24	16	53	51	23	33
111	I read the daily newspaper and/or news weeklies (e.g., Time, Newsweek): A) Regularly; B) Frequently; C) Occasionally/seldom or never	36	47	32	31	32	22
17	The editorial section of the newspaper is the part I like best. A) Agree/agree somewhat; B) Disagree somewhat/strongly disagree	47	46	53	54	--	--

[1] See description of items (this table) for meaning of "A," "B," and "C" responses.

[2] Factor loading for this item is in the opposite direction from loadings on other items.

is somewhat less objection to sneaking into movies without paying and distorting a story to present a better self-image. Likewise, even though cheating was condemned by the students as seriously wrong, about three-fifths of them admitted to having indulged in the behavior.

Racial prejudice does not seem to be high in the group. However, the students sampled are not as free of prejudice in the area of integrated housing as in other questions. The factor needs to be strengthened by addition of items in order to gain a clearer picture of prejudice as it exists on the two campuses.

Significant but small inter-school differences existed on Factors VIII, IX, and X, the intellectual-aesthetic scales. Grade point average and College Board scores were higher for School II, which may or may not account for the differences in intellectual values found. New curricular programs introduced at School II may also have attracted brighter students to its campus. Interest in intellectual matters is verbalized but the expressed behavior measures on the value are less frequently performed.

Comparison of Faculty-Nominated "Ideal" Students with Other Students

Denotation as an "ideal" or "non-ideal" student was accomplished by punching the number of votes received by each subject on his data cards. Thus considered as a variable (Variable 5), this fact was correlated with all other measures and indicators employed in this study, indicating relationships with degree of "idealness." The correlation matrices are presented on Tables 21 and 22.

It was hypothesized that a group of "ideal" students selected by the faculty would:

a. Have better high school grades, college grade point averages, and College Board scores than "non-ideals."

b. Have higher scores on intellectual-aesthetic values than "non-ideals."

c. More frequently attend intellectual and fine arts events.

d. Not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable.

Table 21

Correlation Matrix[1] of Variables on which "Ideals" had Significantly Different Scores from "Non-Ideals"--School I

	1	2	3	4	5[2]	7	26	30	33	34	40	43	72	73	74	75	77	78	79	80	81	86
1		526**	472**	564*	455**	-584**	056	162**	187**	106*	-142**	-005	-148**	191**	249**	286**	192**	185**	-330**	-115*	-230**	095*
2	421		540**	870**	282**	-394**	016	135**	104**	003	-018	026	-045	168**	144**	161**	084*	194**	-267**	-159**	-268**	091*
3	421	725		874**	231**	-406**	-051	028	007	018	-113**	043	-152**	152**	172**	151**	114**	173**	-260**	027	-045	124**
4	421	725	725		301**	-458**	-022	093*	061	014	-064	045	-112**	184**	180**	176**	112**	200**	-294**	-066	-172**	124**
5	237	237	237	237		-258**	130*	170**	176**	190**	-216**	-218**	-253**	168**	181**	190**	227**	156*	-312**	-171**	-211**	158*
7	433	725	725	725	239		013	-134**	-066	-048	185**	-037	252**	-168**	-279**	-195**	-127**	-145**	251**	088*	121**	-089*
26	429	721	721	721	236	741		027	033	028	008	-030	-058	012	046	-011	-010	-040	-022	-015	-019	-013
30	428	720	720	720	237	739	736		306**	301**	-042	-133**	-075*	172**	115**	097*	057	049	-241**	-233**	-324**	-043
33	426	717	717	717	236	736	733	736		302**	-009	-099**	-006	078*	072	017	-003	056	-287**	-273**	-428**	-028
34	422	712	712	712	235	730	728	730	728		-084**	-217**	-081*	096*	068	036	008	077*	-342**	-306	-259	024
40	415	697	697	697	231	714	711	709	707	700		070*	533**	-114**	-179**	-083**	-066**	-133**	073	062	068	105**
43	418	681	681	681	230	698	695	693	690	685	676		024	-034	027	014	036	-018	154**	108**	127**	-001
72	433	724	724	724	239	744	740	738	735	729	713	697		-325**	-425**	-289**	-284**	-195**	216**	093*	115**	-269**
73	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744		297**	440**	462**	112**	-276**	-192**	-156**	164**
74	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744	745		439**	343**	247**	-285**	-193**	-187**	244**
75	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744	745	745		762**	166**	-222**	-159**	-067	169
77	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744	745	745	745		146**	-177**	-1[illegible]3**	-013	176**
78	433	724	724	724	239	744	740	738	735	729	713	697	744	744	744	744	744		-204**	-117**	-189**	191**
79	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744	745	745	745	745	744		531**	524**	-111**
80	433	724	724	724	239	744	740	738	735	729	713	697	744	744	744	744	744	744	744		493**	-104*
81	433	725	725	725	239	745	741	739	736	730	714	698	744	745	745	745	745	744	745	744		072*
86	433	724	724	724	239	744	740	738	735	729	713	697	744	744	744	744	744	744	744	744	744	

---

[1] Correlations are charted above the diagonal; N's are charted below the diagonal. Decimal pts. omitted.

[2] Variable 5 represents faculty-nominated ideal students. Appendix F lists all variables of the study.

*Significant beyond .05 level of confidence

**Significant beyond .01 level of confidence

Table 22

Correlation Matrix[1] of Variables on which "Ideals" had Significantly Different Scores from "Non-Ideals"--School II

	1	2	3	4	5[2]	7	29	34	44	79	80	81
1		547**	472**	565**	360**	-608**	004	073	-203**	-278**	-056	-081
2	213		566**	873**	235**	-418**	046	-027	-141**	-245**	-182	-195
3	213	358		895**	201**	-431**	-042	-063	060	-163**	082	031
4	213	358	358		246**	-478**	-001	-052	-038	-232**	-050	-086
5	262	358	358	358		-187**	113**	184**	-200**	-255**	-147**	-122**
7	262	358	358	358	411		026	088	050	097	048	022
29	261	351	351	351	404	404		118*	-132**	-266**	-306**	-301**
34	260	349	349	349	402	402	395		-109*	-256**	-326**	-087
44	262	357	357	357	409	409	402	400		195**	166**	162**
79	262	358	358	358	411	411	404	402	409		536**	520**
80	262	358	358	358	411	411	404	402	409	411		449**
81	262	358	358	358	411	411	404	402	409	411	411	

[1] Correlations are charted above the diagonal; N's are charted below the diagonal. Decimal points are omitted.

[2] Variable 5 represents the faculty-nominated ideal students. Appendix F lists all the variables of the study.

*Significant beyond .05 level of confidence.

**Significant beyond .01 level of confidence.

Section "a" of Hypothesis 1 was supported (Variables 1-4, 7). Faculty members are trained to recognize good academic performance and intellectual potential and so would exhibit a natural bias in this respect. Students selected as "ideal" had lower scores on Factors VIII, IX, and X (Variables 79-81), indicative of stronger intellectual-aesthetic values and confirming section "b" of the hypothesis described above. Section "c" of the first hypothesis was likewise accepted. On both campuses, students selected as "ideal" attended more public lectures (Variable 34) than their "non-ideal" peers. In addition, School I "ideals" went to plays (Variable 30) and visited art galleries (Variable 33) more frequently. "Ideals" in School II were more likely to be found browsing in book stores than "non-ideals."

Section "d" of Hypothesis 1, postulating that "ideals" would not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable, was not supported. In addition to the sources of variation described above, School I "ideals" had more desirable scores on all the factors (Variables 72-78) with the exception of Factor V (jealousy; revenge, Variable 76), were more likely to come from suburbs or cities than from farms or small towns (Variable 26), and experienced a religious attitude change in greater numbers than their "non-ideal" peers (Variable 43). Greater numbers of "ideal" students from School II planned to apply to graduate school (Variable 44) than those who were not selected as "ideal."

Faculty-nominated "ideal" students failed to differ significantly from students not so selected in the following areas: year in college (Variable 6); frequenting the public library (Variable 31); attending concerts, symphonies, or the ballet (Variable 32); religious organizational membership or involvement in volunteer works (Variables 35-39); participation in sacraments (Variables 40-42); reasons for praying (Variables 66-68); parents' occupation, educational level, religion, or marital status (Variables 45-50); position in family (Variable 51); reasons for attending this college (Variables 52-54); expectations from college and life (Variables 57-65, 69-71); conversation topics engaged in (Variables 54-56) or Factor V: jealousy and revenge (Variable 76).

Intercorrelations Among the Variables

As is evident from Appendix H, quite a number of significant correlations exist among the factors. This is due, first, to the fact that each factor includes only some of the items which load on the factor, i.e., those above .3; second, the refactoring of factors tended to produce complex item groups within each factor, and it is likely that some of these contain significant variation that could contribute to another factor; third, since items are scored with equal weights, rather than in proportion to their loadings on a specific factor, the orthogonal relationships between factors could thus be attenuated; fourth, the orthogonal factor solutions employed here are extremely conservative in suggesting no relationship among the factors, and we could also be seeing the fact that it is just not possible to completely separate the religious-moral and intellectual-aesthetic domains.

Since there were over 600 significant correlations among the 86 variables of the study, it would be impractical to discuss them all. However, some are especially worthy of comment, particularly those relating to the hypotheses. All of the correlations mentioned in this section did attain the .01 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2: That background factors selected for study would affect student values in such a way that academic ability, achievement indicators and related interests (Variables 1-4, 7, 29-34, and 44) would be positively correlated with intellectual values (Variables 79-80).

Significance was reached with Factor VIII (intellectual values) and all the variables enumerated above with which it was correlated. (See Table 23 for illustration of these relationships.) The highest correlations with Factor VIII were reached in Variables 2 and 4, the verbal portion and total score of the CEEB (r = -.306 and -.318 respectively); Variable 33, frequency of visits to art galleries (r = -.300), and Variable 34, attendance at public lectures (r = -.309). Since a low score on Factor VIII is the pro-intellectual score, the correlation between it and the variable appears to be negative, whereas it is positive.

Factor IX (world affairs and reading interest) correlated significantly with all of the named variables except college grade point average and the mathematics portion of the College Board scores. The absence of a meaningful correlation be-

TABLE 26

Correlations of Factors VIII and IX with Academic Ability, Achievement Indicators and Related Interests: Hypothesis 2

	Description of Variable	N	Factor VIII[1]	Factor IX
1.	College grade point average	844	** -144	-032
2.	College Board scores (verbal)	1083	** -306	** -194
3.	College Board scores (math)	1083	** -263	-011
4.	College Board scores (total)	1083	** -318	** -110
7.	High school grades	1156	** 235	** 094
29.	Frequenting of an off-campus bookstore for browsing	1136	** -272	** -252
30.	Attendance at plays and other dramatic performances	1145	** -243	** -227
31.	Trips to the public library	1141	** -151	** -129
32.	Attendance at a concert, symphony, or ballet	1137	** -253	** -213
33.	Visits to art galleries or exhibits	1142	** -300	** -261
34.	Attendance at voluntary public lectures	1132	** -309	** -290
44.	Intention to pursue graduate studies	1152	** 150	** 131

[1] Reverse direction of scoring for the two factors makes the correlation between the test variables and the factors negative, except for Variables 7 and 44. Decimal points are omitted.

**Significant beyond the .01 level of confidence tween Factor IX and mathematics scores is understandable, since the former involves some verbal skills perhaps not essential to performing well in mathematics. On the other hand, the verbal and mathematical portions of the CEEB (SAT) are highly correlated (r = .580). The reason for non-significance in correlations between Factor IX and college grade point average is not clear, especially in view of the fact that significance was reached when Factor IX was correlated with high school grades. One possible explanation is that college grade point average was obtained for this study from available records, whereas students were asked to indicate through the questionnaire what their high school academic average had been. The latter approach may not be as accurate as the former.

It is interesting to note that one of the aesthetically-oriented items (frequenting art galleries) was more highly correlated with the strictly intellectual Factors (VIII and IX) than were some of the variables which seem to be closer to the intellectual domain, e.g., academic grades (Variables 1 and 7), use of the public library (Variable 31), browsing in book stores (Variable 29), and intention to pursue graduate studies (Variable 44). The reason for this finding is not readily apparent. Hypothesis 2, with the exception of the two instances noted above, was confirmed.

Hypothesis 3: That attendance at Mass, reception of Holy Communion and frequency of confession would be positively correlated with religious and moral values.

The hypothesis was supported by the data (see Table 24). The most meaningful relationships were between Factor I (religious values) and the religious practices indicated (r = .517, .589, .497 respectively). Since other religious practices are found on Factor I, the placement of these sacrament items as separate variables provides another opportunity for measuring the relationship between religious practices and alternate measures of religiosity.

One other item is worthy of comment at this point. Forty-seven per cent of the total sample selected religious beliefs and activities as one of the three main sources of life satisfaction. Compare this data with Goldsen's finding of 18 per cent for religious activities (Goldsen, et al., 1960) and Salisbury's report of 63 per cent among Catholic women students who place religion among the three top sources of life satisfaction. The differences found could be partly due to the variation in wording: "religious

TABLE 24

Correlation of Religious and Moral Values with Selected Religious Practices: Hypothesis 3
(N = 1156)

Description of Variable	Factors						
	I	II	III[1]	IV	V	VI	VII
40. Attendance at Mass	517**	-140**	-143**	-067*	-056	-076*	-084**
41. Reception of Communion	589**	-162**	-183**	-102**	-103**	-071*	-086**
42. Frequency of Confession	497**	-072*	-156**	-035	-018	-078**	-017

Note. -- Decimal points are omitted.

[1] Reverse direction of scoring for Factors III-VII makes the correlation between the test variables and the factors negative.

*Significant beyond the .05 level of confidence

**Significant beyond the .01 level of confidence belief and activities," "religious activities, and "religion." It is difficult to assess what portion of the 47 per cent in the present study was responding to "belief" and what number to "activities." In any event, the percentage of students who give religion a prominent place in their lives is sizeable.

Summary

A questionnaire, WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, was developed to measure religious, moral, and intellectual-aesthetic values of women students in Catholic colleges. A factor analysis of this instrument yielded ten factor-dimensions. Factors I (religious values), III (moral values: honesty), VIII (intellectual values), and X (aesthetic values) contributed most to the total variance. Other factors observed dealt with consensual religiosity (F II), cheating and stealing (F IV), jealousy and revenge (F V), "catty," risque and scandalous stories (F VI), racial prejudice (FVII), and interest in world affairs and serious reading (F IX).

Three of the four hypotheses developed for the research were confirmed.

1. That a group of "ideal" students selected by the faculty would:

   a. have better high school grades, college grade point averages, and College Board scores than "non-ideals;"

   b. have higher scores on intellectual-aesthetic values than "non-ideals;"

   c. more frequently attend intellectual and fine arts events;

   d. not differ significantly from "non-ideals" on any other variable.

   Confirmed for parts "a," "b," and "c."

2. That background factors selected for study would affect student values in such a way that academic ability, achievement indicators, and related interests (Variables 1-4, 7, 29-34, 44) would be positively correlated with intellectual values (Factors VIII and IX). Confirmed for all the variables with

F VIII and for all except Variables 1 and 3 with F IX.

3. That attendance at Mass, reception of Holy Communion and frequency of confession (Variables 40-42) would be positively correlated with religious and moral values (Factors I-VII). Confirmed for Variable 41 with all the factors, for Variable 40 with all the factors except F V, for Variable 42 for all the factors except F IV.

4. That no inter-school differences in values held by students in the two colleges would be found. Not confirmed.

Data from this study were compared with previous research. Background factors, as they related to the patterns of values observed, were analyzed.

Religiosity, assessed by a variety of criteria, appears to be high and multi-dimensional on the two campuses. On items attempting to measure moral values, students are very likely to label certain behaviors as morally wrong, but statements about their probable behavior relative to these issues is not in keeping with the values they profess. It may be, as noted by Havighurst (1962), that moral development for these students is still in progress. There is also room for considerable growth in intellectual values, particularly for School I.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Two categories of recommendations suggest themselves: (1) those which relate to the broad purposes of higher education in general and Catholic education in particular, and (2) those which involve further analysis of the data gathered for the present study or are quite integrally connected with this investigation. These two areas will be discussed separately.

Recommendations for Higher Education

1. After value assessments of students have been made, it would seem important for an institution to look at its administrative policies as well as its curricular and other programs to discover

   a. whether these policies, programs, and the total college climate are designed to assist students to clarify their commitments and grow toward more positive values, or

   b. whether these policies and programs interfere with students' growth in positive values or simply have no effect on them at all.

Conversely, a college might look at the kinds of students it attracts to determine whether this factor is interfering with the achievement of institutional objectives.

2. Methods of turning vague concepts about morality into convictions and assisting students in the development of workable moral standards for themselves need to be developed and assessed, as Eddy (1959) noted, through

   a. encouraging conscious examination and evaluation of values,

   b. providing opportunities for the practice of positive values,

   c. creating a climate which gives direction to student mores,

d. conveying an explicit concern for moral values.

The instrument developed in this study could be employed as both a teaching and evaluation device to aid such efforts.

3. The extent to which students see religion as related to life needs to be determined and programs inaugurated, particularly through theology departments, to effect an integration of life's significant dimensions and spiritual values.

4. An analysis of religious and secular values and the extent to which they are in conflict could also be researched.

5. Maintaining Catholic colleges and universities is becoming almost prohibitive from a financial point of view. Research on the impact this type of institution has on its students should lead to realistic decisions about its continued existence. Administration of an instrument such as WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK could provide periodic assessment of students' religious, moral, and intellectual-aesthetic values and the role of the institution in regard to them.

Specific Recommendations Pertinent to the Present Study

1. The questionnaire which was developed for the present investigation needs to be administered to additional samples of college students in order to validate it further. Besides contributing to refinement of the instrument, additional usage would indicate how typical of Catholic higher education the sample in the present study is and also help establish group norms.

2. The 1966 study employing WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK was designed in such a way that a follow-up study with the freshmen of the sample can be made during their senior year. Such a longitudinal approach will permit of statements relative to growth and changes in values within an individual over time with the additional experience of higher education.

3. Assessment of faculty values was begun in the present study. The qualities the faculty selected as bases for nomination of "ideal" students could be used in constructing an instrument to further assess faculty values. Then it could be determined how congruent their values are with institutional objectives and student interests and goals.

4. Using the data gathered for the current study, freshman-senior differences in values could be assessed. Statements about value changes within an individual over time cannot be made in a cross-sectional study, but group differences in the senior population related to attrition and maturation can be investigated. This process, if repeated in subsequent years with additional freshman-senior women, could begin to produce a picture of differences in senior as well as freshman classes through the years.

5. It would be valuable to have questionnaire data on a student population of mixed religious affiliation from other than Catholic campuses. With such information, statements could be made as to how this group differs from Catholic college students on the factors. Furthermore, if a group of Catholic students on a non-Catholic campus was studied, value differences in a religiously homogeneous group who had chosen to attend various types of colleges could be determined. Such assessments could begin to shed light on the meaning of actual institutional variation.

6. The extent to which accumulation of previous Catholic schooling affects student values in college could be determined. This information could then be compared with other research in this area (Greeley and Rossi, 1966; McNamara, 1963; Trent, 1967).

In conclusion, the values described in the foregoing pages provide a rather comprehensive picture of which student values predominate on the two campuses studied. Faculty members, administrators, and students are in a position to use the information to develop new directions for their institutions in the future.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allen, E.E. and R.W. Hites. Factors in Religious Attitudes of Older Adolescents. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 55, 265-273.

Allen, R.O. and B. Spilka. Committed and Consensual Religion: A Specification of Religion-Prejudice Relationships. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1967, 6, 191-206.

Allport, G.W. and J.M. Ross. Personal Religious Orientation and Prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 432-443.

Allport, G.W. and P.E. Vernon. Study of Values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Allport, G.W., P.E. Vernon, and G. Lindzey. Study of Values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Argyle, M. Religious Behavior. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

Barton, A.H. Studying the Effects of a College Education: A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in College. New Haven: Hazen Foundation, 1959.

Barton, A.H. Measuring the Values of Individuals. Research Supplement to Religious Education, 1962, 57, S-62--S-97.

Bem, D.J. An Experimental Analysis of Beliefs and Attitudes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1964.

Benne, K.D. and G.E. Swanson (Eds.). The Problem of Values and the Social Scientist. Journal of Social Issues, 1950, 6, (4), 1-7.

Bidwell, C.E. (Ed.). The American College and Student Personality: A Survey of Research Progress and Problems. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Bower, W.C. Moral and Spiritual Values in Education. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1952.

Bowers, W.J. *Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College.* New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1964.

Broen, W.E., Jr. A Factor Analytic Study of Religious Attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1957, *54*, 176-179.

Brown, D.R. Non-Intellective Qualities and the Perception of the Ideal Student by College Faculty. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 1960, *33*, 269-278.

Brown, D.R. Personality, College Environment, and Academic Productivity. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American College.* New York: John Wiley, 1962, Pp. 536-562.

Brown, N.C. Orientation to College Learning--A Reappraisal. Unpublished Report of a Conference on the Introduction of Entering Students to the Intellectual Life of the College, Princeton University, 1960.

Brumbaugh, A.J. *Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Burgess, E.W. Values and Sociological Research. *Social Problems*, 1954, *2*, (1), 16-20.

Campbell, Doris K. Differences of Values Among College Students at Different Class Levels. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1962.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Student Values. *Sixtieth Annual Report.* 1965, 11-20.

Cattell, R.B. *Factor Analysis.* New York: Harper, 1952.

Catton, W.R., Jr. A Retest of the Measurability of Certain Human Values. *American Sociological Review*, 1956, *21*, 357-359.

Center for the Study of Higher Education. *Omnibus Personality Inventory--Form Fy.* Berkeley, California: University of California, 1964.

Christ, F.L. and G.E. Sherry. *American Catholicism and the Intellectual Ideal.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Cooper, J.B. and J.L. McGaugh. *Integrating Principles of Social Psychology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1963.

Cronbach, L.J. *Essentials of Psychological Testing*. (2nd ed.) New York; Harper, 1960, 247-268.

David, Opal D. *The Education of Women--Signs for the Future.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Davis, J.A. *Faculty Perceptions of Students*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1964.

Donovan, John D. *The Academic Man in the Catholic College.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

Duffy, Elizabeth. A Critical Review of Investigations Employing the Allport-Vernon Study of Values and Other Tests of Evaluative Attitude. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1940, *37*, 597-612.

Dukes, W.F. Psychological Studies of Values. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1955, *52*, 24-50.

Eddy, E.D., Jr. *The College Influence on Student Character.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Edwards, A.L. *Techniques for Attitude Scale Construction.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Ellis, J.T. *American Catholics and the Intellectual Life.* Chicago: The Heritage Foundation, 1956.

Eurich, A.C. Conference on Moral and Ethical Values. Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1965. (Mimeographed)

Fallding, H. A Proposal for the Empirical Study of Values. *American Sociological Review*, 1965, *30*, 223-253.

Faulkner, J.E. and G.F. DeJong. Religiosity in 5-D: An Empirical Analysis. *Social Forces*, 1966, *45*, 246-254.

Feagin, J.R. Prejudice and Religious Types. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1964, *4*, 3-13.

Fernandes, H.J.X. Desirable Characteristics of Freshmen as Seen by the Faculty in the Various Units of the University of Michigan. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1964.

Fichter, J.H. Religious Values and the Social Personality. American Catholic Sociological Review, 1956, 17, 109-116.

Flanagan, G.F. An Investigation of Religious Attitudes Among Catholic Seniors in College who have had Varying Amounts and Levels of Catholic Schooling. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957.

Ford, C.E. and E.L. Roy. The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Education Association, 1968.

Foster, J. The Impact of a Value-Oriented University on Student Attitudes and Thinking. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961.

Fredrickson, L.C. A Study of Adolescent Values. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Freedman, M.B. The Passage Through College. In N. Sanford (Ed.), Personality Development During the College Years, Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, (4), 13-28.

Freedman, M.B. The Impact of the College. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.

Friedman, M. The Source of Moral Authority. Religious Education, 1962, 57, 410-415.

Fruchter, B. Introduction to Factor Analysis. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1954.

Fukuyama, Y. The Major Dimensions of Church Membership. Review of Religious Research, 1961, 2, 154-161.

Gardner, L.A. Certain Religious Attitudes and Beliefs of Students in a Lutheran College with References to their Value Structures and Personality Variables. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1960.

Gilliland, A.R. Changes in Religious Beliefs of College Students. *Journal of Social Psychology,* 1953, *37,* 113-116.

Gilman, R.C. Postscript to the Jacob Study. *Religious Education,* 1960, *55,* 15-23.

Ginzberg, E. (Ed.). *Values and Ideals of American Youth.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Glock, C.Y. On the Study of Religious Commitment. *Research Supplement to Religious Education,* 1962, *57,* S-98--S-110.

Glock, C.Y., B.B. Ringer, and E. Babbie. *To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Glock, C.Y. and R. Stark. *Religion and Society in Tension.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Godin, A. Importance and Difficulty of Scientific Research in Religious Education: The Problem of the "Criterion." *Religious Education,* 1962, *57,* 163-171, 238.

Goldsen, Rose K., M. Rosenberg, R. Williams, Jr., and E.A. Suchman. *What College Students Think.* Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1960.

Goodson, M.R., T. Brameld, and A.J. Sullivan. The Value Choices of College Sophomores: A Cooperative Study. *Journal of Education,* 1961, *144,* 3-31.

Grace, Gloria L. and H.A. Grace. The Relationship Between Verbal and Behavioral Measures of Value. *Journal of Educational Research,* 1952, *46,* 123-131.

Greeley, A.M. *The Changing Catholic College.* Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Greeley, A.M. and P. Rossi. *The Education of Catholic Americans.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Habein, Margaret L. (Ed.). *Spotlight on the College Student.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Haley, Sister Marie Philip. An Attitude Scale in Religion for Catholic Colleges. *Journal of Religious Instruction,* 1941, *11,* 919-927.

Harman, H.H. Modern Factor Analysis. (2nd ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Hassenger, R. Religious Values and Personality Traits of Catholic College Women. Insight, 1964, 3, (2), 37-48.

Hassenger, R. (Ed.). The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Havemann, E. and Patricia West. They Went to College. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1952.

Havens, J. The Changing Climate of Research on the College Student and His Religion. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1963, 3, 52-69.

Havighurst, R.J. American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1960.

Havighurst, R.J. How the Moral Life is Formed. Religious Education, 1962, 57, 432-439.

Heider, F. Attitudes and Cognitive Organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.

Heist, P. Diversity in College Student Characteristics. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1960, 33, 279-291.

Heist, P., T.R. McConnell, F. Matsler, and P. Williams. Personality and Scholarship. Science, 1961, 133, 362-367.

Heist, P. and H. Webster. Differential Characteristics of Student Bodies with Implications for Selection and Study of Undergraduates. Berkeley, California: University of California, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1959. (Mimeographed)

Holland, J.L. Determinants of College Choice. College and University, 1959, 35, 11-28.

Horn, J.L. On Subjectivity in Factor Analysis. (Dittoed)

Horn, J.L. A Rationale and Test for the Number of Factors in Factor Analysis. Psychometrika, 1965, 30, 179-185.

Horst, P. Factor Analysis of Data Matrices. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Hotelling, H. Analysis of a Complex of Statistical Variables with Principal Components. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1933, 24, 417-441.

Hottel, Althea K. How Fare American Women? Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955.

Huntley, C.W. Changes in Study of Values Scores During the Four Years of College. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1965, 71, 349-383.

Jacob, P.E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Jacob, P.E. Education for Social Responsibility. Washington, D.C.: The American National Red Cross, 1961.

Jervis, F.M. and R.G. Congdon. Student and Faculty Perceptions of Educational Values. The American Psychologist, 1958, 13, 464-466.

Johnson, S.W. Values as Related to the Criteria of Personal Adjustment, Suggestibility, and Ethical Behavior. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska Teacher's College, 1962.

Kauffman, J.F. The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Connecticut: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.

Kelsey, I.B. A Comparative Study of Values of Students Attending the University of British Columbia in 1963 as Measured by the Allport-Vernon Test for Personal Values. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington, 1963.

Kemp, C.G. Changes in Patterns of Personal Values. Religious Education, 1961, 56, 63-69.

Kluckhohn, C. The Scientific Study of Values. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 1958, 102, 469-476.

Kosa, J., et al. Religious Participation, Religious Knowledge and School Aptitude: An Empirical Study. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1961, 1, 88-97.

Lane, R., Jr. The Consequential Dimension of Religiosity Among Catholics. Sociological Analysis, 1966, 27, 94-100.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. and W. Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Leatherman, R.L. An Empirical Study of Attitudes and Values in a University Faculty. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.

Lehmann, I.J. and P.L. Dressel. Critical Thinking, Attitudes and Values in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

Lehmann, I.J. and P.L. Dressel. Changes in Critical Thinking, Ability, Attitudes, and Values Associated with College Attendance. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963.

Lenski, G. The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Lewin, K. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

Lunsford, T.F. (Ed.). The Study of Campus Cultures. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

McConnell, T.R. The Diversification of American Higher Education: A Research Program. The Educational Record, 1957, 38, 300-315.

McConnell, T.R. and P. Heist. Do Students Make the College? College and University, 1959, 34, 442-452.

McKenna, Sister Helen Veronica. Religious Attitudes and Personality Traits. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 54, 379-388.

McNamara, R.J. The Interplay of Intellectual and Religious Values. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1963.

Magnusson, D. *Test Theory.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

Maslow, A.H. (Ed.). *New Knowledge in Human Values.* New York: Harper, 1959.

Means, R.L. Intellectuals Within the Church, *Religious Education,* 1960, *55*, 341-344.

Miller, Eleanor O. Non-Academic Changes in College Students. *The Educational Record*, 1959, *40*, 118-122.

Morris, C. *Varieties of Human Value.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Mowrer, O.H. Science, Religion, and Student Values. *The Christian Century,* 1963, *80*, 1200-1202.

Nelson, E. Patterns of Religious Attitude Shifts from College to Fourteen Years Later. *Psychological Monographs,* 1956, *70*, (17), 1-15.

Neuwein, R. (Ed.). *Catholic Schools in Action.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Newcomb, T.M. *Study of College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1961.

Newcomer, Mabel. *A Century of Higher Education for American Women.* New York: Harper, 1959.

O'Brien, J.A. (Ed.). *Catholics and Scholarship.* Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, 1939.

O'Dea, T.F. *American Catholic Dilemma: An Inquiry Into the Intellectual Life.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1958.

Pace, C.R. *College and University Environment Scales.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Pace, C.R. *The Influence of Academic and Student Subcultures in College and University Environments.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

Peck, R.F. and R.J. Havighurst. *The Psychology of Character Development.* New York: John Wiley, 1960.

Pattillo, M.M. and D.M. MacKenzie. *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Pemberton, W.A. *Ability, Values, and College Achievement.* Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware, 1963.

Pittel, S.M. and G.A. Mendelsohn. Measurement of Moral Values: A Review and Critique. *Psychological Bulletin,* 1966, *66*, 22-35.

Plant, W.T. On the Contention that College Produces Increased Homogeneity of Student Values, Attitudes, and Beliefs. The Twelfth Annual State Conference on Educational Research, California, 1960. (Mimeographed)

Plant, W.T. *Personality Changes Associated with a College Education.* San Jose, California: San Jose State College, 1962.

Raushenbush, Esther. Changing Values and Attitudes on the Campus--A Look to the Future. In *Long Range Planning for Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

Raushenbush, Esther. *The Student and His Studies.* Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1964.

Rettig, S. and B. Pasamanick. Changes in Moral Values Among College Students: A Factorial Study. *American Sociological Review,* 1959, *24*, 856-863.

Riesman, D.A. The "Jacob Report." *American Sociological Review,* 1958, *23*, 732-739.

Riesman, D.A. Student Culture and Faculty Values. In Margaret L. Habein (Ed.), *Spotlight on the College Student.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959, Pp. 8-24.

Riesman, D. and C. Jencks. The Viability of the American College. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American College.* New York: John Wiley, 1962. Pp. 74-198.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic, 1960.

Roscoe, J.T. The Construction and Application of the Polyphasic Value Inventory. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965.

Ross, M.G. Religious Beliefs of Youth. New York: Associated Press, 1950.

Rossi, P.H. and A. Greeley. The Impact of the Roman Catholic Denominational School. The School Review, 1964, 72, (1), 34-51.

Rossi, P.H. and Alice S. Rossi. Some Effects of Parochial School Education in America. Daedalus, 1961, 90, 300-328.

Rozeboom, W.W. Foundations of the Theory of Prediction. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1966, 210-291.

Salisbury, W.S. Religion and the College Student. Albany: Research Foundation, State University of New York, 1957.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). Personality Development During College Years. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, (4), 13-28.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). The American College. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Scheibe, K.E. On the Relationship Between Beliefs and Values: An Experimental and Theoretical Analysis. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1963.

Scriven, M. Student Values as Educational Objectives. Proceedings of the 1965 Invitational Conference of Testing Problems, 1966, 33-49.

Seitz, T.L. The Relation Between Creativity and Intelligence, Personality, and Value Patterns in Adolescence. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Denver, 1964.

Shuster, G.N. Catholic Education in a Changing World. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Simms, J.C. Values and Status Variables as Determinants of Academic Achievement. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Emory University, 1962.

Smith, J.E. Value Convictions and Higher Education. New Haven: Hazen Foundation, 1958.

Smith, R.O. Factors Affecting the Religion of College Students. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Lane Hall, 1947.

Spilka, B. Some Personality Correlates of Interiorized and Institutionalized Religious Beliefs. Psychological Newsletter, 1958, 9, 103-107.

Sprague, H.T. (Ed.). Research on College Students. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.

Stark, R. and C.Y. Glock. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Vol. 1. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1968.

Stern, G.G. Student Values and Their Relationship to the College Environment. In H.T. Sprague (Ed.), Research on College Students. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.

Stern, G.G. Characteristics of the Intellectual Climate in College Environments. Harvard Educational Review 1963, 33, 5-41.

Strang, Ruth. Behavior and Background of Students in College and Secondary School. New York: Harper, 1937.

Sundland, D.M. Brief Resume of the Number of Factors in Factor Analysis, 1967. (Dittoed)

Tead, O. Emphasis on Values in College Teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 1960, 31, 14-20.

Telford, C.W. A Study of Religious Attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 31, 217-230.

Thistlethwaite, D.L. College Press and Student Achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50, 183-191.

Thomson, G.H. *The Factorial Analysis of Human Ability.* (5th ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Thurstone, L.L. The Measurement of Values. *Psychological Review*, 1954, *61*, 47-58.

Thurstone, L.L. and E.J. Chave. *The Measurement of Attitude.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Tillery, H.D. Differential Characteristics of Entering Freshmen at the University of California and their Peers at California Junior Colleges. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.

Tisdale, J.R. Psychological Value Theory and Research: 1930-1960. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1961.

Trent, J.W. The Etiology of Catholic Intellectualism. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.

Trent, J.W. *Catholics in College.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Twomey, A.E. A Study of Values of a Select Group of Undergraduate Students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1962.

Vaccaro, L.C. (Ed.). *Toward New Dimensions of Catholic Higher Education.* Arlington, Virginia: Education Research Associates, 1967.

Wakin, E. *The Catholic Campus.* New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Warnath, C.F. and H.R. Fordyce. Inventoried Values of Entering College Freshmen. *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1961, *39*, 277-281.

Watts, H.J. Methodological Problems in the Measurement of Values. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962.

Webster, H. Changes in Attitudes During College. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1958, *49*, 109-117.

White, J. L. Value-Orientation and Behavior. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1966.

Wilson, C. W. Extrinsic Religious Values and Prejudice. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 1960, *60,* 286-288.

Wilson, P. A. An Assessment of Intellective and Non-Intellective Factors in Faculty Perception of Superior Students at Colgate University. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Colgate University, 1966.

Wise, W. M. *They Come for the Best of Reasons: College Students Today.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Withey, S. B. The Influence of the Peer Group on the Values of Youth. *Research Supplement to Religious Education,* 1962, *57,* S-34--S-44.

Wright, J. C. Personal Adjustment and Its Relationship to Religious Attitude and Certainty. *Religious Education,* 1959, *54,* 521-523.

APPENDIX A

IDENTIFICATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BY SOURCE

Omnibus Personality Inventory (Center for the Study of Higher Education,[1] University of California, Berkeley, California, 1959)

8 (Ed),[2] 19, 24, 26, 28, 44, 74, 117 (Ed), 119 (Ed), 122, 125, 127, 131, 134 (Ed), 135 (Ed), 136 (Ed), 138 (Ed), 139 (Ed), 140 (Ed), 143 (Ed), 144 (Ed), 146 (Ed), 148 (Ed), 150 (Ed), 151 (Ed), 152 (Ed), 154 (Ed), 156 (Ed), 159 (Ed), 160 (Ed), 162 (Ed), 163 (Ed), 165 (Ed), 168 (Ed).

Minnesota Thinking-Social-Emotional Introversion-Extroversion Inventory (Evans, Catherine, and T.R. McConnell, 1942)

8 (Ed), 134 (Ed), 135, 138, 140 (Ed), 143, 144, 146, 148, 150 (Ed), 151, 152, 154 (Ed), 156, 159, 160, 162 (Ed), 165, 168.

Mundelein College Student Questionnaire (Developed by college faculty committee under the direction of Kenneth Clark, 1963)

9b[3] (Ed), 16b (Ed), 17b (Ed), 18b (Ed), 23b (Ed), 24b (Ed), 25b (Ed), 57, 78 (Ed), 82-84 (Ed), 147, 153 (Ed), 164 (Ed).

Vassar College Attitude Inventory (Sanford, Nevitt, Mervin Freedman, and Harold Webster, 1957)

7, 11, 19, 23, 28, 29, 36 (Ed), 51 (Ed), 55, 67 (Ed), 76 (Ed), 79, 120, 158 (Ed).

---

[1] Now Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

[2] Revisions of items are indicated by (Ed) following item numbers. Item numbers are those found in the questionnaire, What College Students Think.

[3] Items from Section I of the questionnaire, background factors, are indicated by "b."

Student Questionnaire I (CCS) (Center for the Study of Higher Education[1], University of California, Berkeley, California, 1963)

14b (Ed), 85-89, 124 (Ed), 141, 142, 155, 157 (Ed), 161.

Kansas City Religious Attitudes Questionnaire (Loretto Academy, Kansas City, Missouri, 1952)

12, 21 (Ed), 22 (Ed), 31, 43 (Ed), 45 (Ed), 53, 64 (Ed), 73 (Ed), 90, 121.

Poe Inventory of Values (Poe, Wesley, 1954)

1 (Ed), 5, 15, 17 (Ed), 33, 40, 69 (Ed), 95 (Ed).

Cooperative Study of Prayer (Chave, E.J., 1929)

34, 61 (Ed), 104 (Ed), 109 (Ed), 167.

National Opinion Research Center Survey of Adult Opinions (University of Chicago, 1963)

4 (Ed), 48 (Ed), 75 (Ed), 80 (Ed).

Cooperative Study of Attitudes and Values of College Students (Michigan State University, 1962, 1963)

38 (Ed), 107, 123.

Cross-Section Interview Schedule (Lenski, Gerhard, 1958)

9 (Ed), 132, 133.

Marquette Religious Approach Scale (Cooke, Bernard, and Paul J. Reiss, 1963)

23b (Ed), 3 (Ed), 137 (Ed).

The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, Harrison G., 1957)

131, 136 (Ed).

Student Questionnaire (Cornell University, 1950, 1952)

26b, 28b, 77 (Ed).

Study of Religious Commitment (Glock, Charles Y., and Rodney Stark, 1962)

27b (Ed), 145 (Ed).

College Characteristics Index (Stern, George, and C. Robert Pace, 1958)

10 (Ed).

National Opinion Research Center Study of Young Adult Attitudes and Opinions (University of Chicago, 1963)

149 (Ed).

Prejudice Scale (Struening, E. L., 1963)

50.

* * * * * * * *

Original Items

1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b, 8b, 10b, 11b, 12b, 13b, 15b, 19b, 20b, 22b, 22b.

2, 6, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 46, 47, 49, 52, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 72, 81, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 126, 128, 129, 130, 166.

APPENDIX B

30 December 1965

Dear ______________________________:

I am about to launch a research project on Catholic college student values and need your assistance. Would you be so kind as to serve as one of the judges of the questionnaire items on the enclosed list? Your evaluation will be very helpful to me in selecting items for the final form of the questionnaire.

Please return the completed form as soon as possible. The directions are on page one. I hope to have all the forms in by January 14, 1966. If, for any reason, you are unable to participate in the study in this way, please return the questionnaire immediately.

Thank you for your time and valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Sister Maureen McCormack, S.L.

SMM:dbh

Enclosure

P.S. If some of the items do not seem appropriate for ____________ College students, please indicate the reason or what kind of revisions would make the items appropriate.

(The P.S. was added to the letters for judges from the participating institutions.)

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO THE TEN JUDGES WHO EVALUATED THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

DIRECTIONS: Read each of the items listed below and place an (X) in the appropriate column to indicate whether the item seems to measure a religious (R), moral (M), or intellectual (I) value according to the following definitions:

RELIGIOUS VALUES:	Those values which concern a person's relationship with God, the worship of God, and his relationship with his fellow worshippers.
MORAL VALUES:	Those values which guide man's thoughts and actions relative to right and wrong, good and evil.
INTELLECTUAL VALUES:	Those values related to study, reflection, devotion to mental pursuits.

If an item, in your opinion, does not clearly fall into one category, place a (?) in the column(s) which seem(s) the most appropriate.

The last column is for your comments or an explanation of any of your ratings. Please feel free to comment on ambiguity of items, especially well- or poorly-constructed items, etc. Suggestions for improvement of individual items will be appreciated.

ITEM	R	M	I	COMMENTS
1. Do you read a great deal even when it is not required in your work?				
2. If I found change in a telephone booth, it is very likely that I would keep it without asking the people nearby if it were theirs.				
3-265. As above.				

APPENDIX D

WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK
QUESTIONNAIRE 1

This is a questionnaire -- not a test. PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS BOOKLET.

On the following pages you will find a series of statements and questions about you, your feelings, opinions, and attitudes. Please answer them as frankly as possible. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS.

WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK

QUESTIONNAIRE 1
SECTION 1

Please indicate your answers to the following questions by circling the number in the answer column which corresponds to the answer you select. CIRCLE ONLY ONE UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED.

		ANSWER COLUMN
1.	What year in college are you? (1) Freshman, (2) Sophomore, (3) Junior, (4) Senior, (5) Unclassified	1 2 3 4 5
2.	What was your approximate academic average in high school? (1) A, (2) B+, (3) B, (4) B-, (5) C+, (6) C, (7) C-, (8) D	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.	What kind of high school did you attend? (If you attended more than one kind, circle as many as apply.) (1) Public, (2) Parish or Diocesan, (3) Private Catholic, (4) Private non-sectarian	1 2 3 4 5
4.	What kind of elementary school did you attend? (If you attended more than one kind, circle as many as apply.) (1) Public, (2) Parish or Diocesan, (3) Private Catholic, (4) Private non-sectarian	1 2 3 4 5
5.	What was the total enrollment of your high school? (If you attended more than one, circle as many as apply.) (1) Under 200, (2) 200-500, (3) 500-800, (4) 800-1000, (5) 1100-1400, (6) 1400-1700, (7) 1700-2000, (8) 2000-3000, (9) 3000-4000, (10) Over 4000	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6.	Which of the following best describes where your family now lives? (1) Farm or rural area, (2) Ranch, (3) Small town (10,000 or less), (4) Suburbs, (5) Small city (110,000-500,000), (6) Large city (500,000+)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7.	What is (will be) your area of concentration or major field? (1) Biology, (2) Chemistry, (3) Math, (4) Interdisciplinary science, (5) English, (6) Foreign language, (7) History, (8) Sociology, (9) Behavioral science, (10) Music, (11) Art, (12) Nursing, (13) Speech and drama	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
8.	Are you in a teacher education program? (1) Yes, (2) No	1 2 3 4 5

		ANSWER COLUMN
9.	How often during the last year or so have you gone to each of the following places? (1) Never, (2) Once or twice, (3) 3 or more times	
	a. An off-campus bookstore for browsing	1 2 3 4 5
	b. Plays and other dramatic performances	1 2 3 4 5
	c. The public library	1 2 3 4 5
	d. Concerts, symphony, or ballet	1 2 3 4 5
	e. Art galleries or exhibits	1 2 3 4 5
	f. Voluntary public lectures	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Please indicate your participation and/or non-involvement in the following by circling the appropriate number(s) in the answer column. (1) I am presently a member of an apostolic organization - Sodality, Legion of Mary, CCD, CSMC, Daily Missionaire, etc. - or plan to join one this year; (2) I used to belong to an organization such as those described in #1, but I am not presently an active member of an apostolic organization, nor do I plan to join one this year; (3) I have been involved regularly in volunteer work with underprivileged children, the sick and aged, those in need of tutoring, or similar groups and/or plan to become so involved this year; (4) I have not been involved in activities such as those described in #3, nor do I plan to become so involved this year; (5) I have not been a member of an apostolic organization in the past, nor do I plan to join one this year.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	How often do you attend Mass? (1) Daily, (2) Twice or more a week, (3) Sundays and holy days, (4) Occasionally, (5) Never	1 2 3 4 5
12.	How often do you receive Holy Communion? (1) Daily, (2) Twice or more a week, (3) Every week, (4) About every other Sunday, (5) About once a month, (6) About once every two months, (7) About once every three months, (8) Once a year, (9) Never	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13.	How often do you go to confession? (1) Every week, (2) Every two weeks, (3) About once a month, (4) About once every two months, (5) About once every three months, (6) About twice a year, (7) About once a year, (8) Rarely, (9) Never	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

ANSWER COLUMN

14. If your attitude toward religion has changed since coming to college, which of the following do you think contributed most to this change? (CIRCLE ONE)
(1) Personal contact with instructors, (2) Daily contacts with students, (3) Contacts with friends, (4) Theology courses, (5) Other course(s), (6) Dormitory life, (7) Men you have dated or known, (8) Books or magazines you have read, (9) Apostolic activities engaged in, (10) Organizations you joined, (11) An event which made a deep impression on you, (12) A retreat you made, (13) My attitude has not changed.

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14 15

15. Are you planning to attend graduate school?
(1) Yes, (2) No, (3) Undecided

1 2 3 4 5

16. In what occupation has your father spent the most time? (If occupation is not listed, circle the one which most nearly describes your father's occupation.)
(1) Professional (physician, lawyer, educator, editor, architect, etc.), (2) Armed services, (3) Executive in a large firm, (4) Owner or manager of a small firm, (5) Middle management (e.g., department head), (6) Salesman, insurance, real estate agent, accountant, etc., (7) Service worker (policeman, fireman, etc.), (8) Skilled worker (plumber, machinist, carpenter, electrician, etc.), (9) Semi-skilled worker

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

17. Which of the following best describes your father's highest educational achievement?
(1) Eighth grade or less, (2) Part high school, (3) High school graduate, (4) Technical school, (5) Some college, (6) College graduate, (7) Master's degree or equivalent, (8) M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., Ph.D., or equivalent

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

18. Which of the following best describes your mother's highest educational achievement?
(1) Eighth grade or less, (2) Part high school, (3) High school graduate, (4) Technical school, (5) Some college, (6) R.N., (7) College graduate, (8) Master's degree or equivalent, (9) M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., Ph.D., or equivalent

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

19. What is your parents' marital status?
(1) Living together, (2) Separated, (3) Divorced, (4) Mother deceased, (5) Father deceased, (6) Both deceased

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

ANSWER COLUMN

20. Please indicate the religious affiliation of your father.
(1) Practicing Catholic, (2) Non-practicing Catholic, (3) Protestant, (4) Non-denominational Christian, (5) Jewish, (6) Eastern Orthodox, (7) Agnostic, (8) Atheist, (9) No religion

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

21. Please indicate the religious affiliation of your mother.
(1) Practicing Catholic, (2) Non-practicing Catholic, (3) Protestant, (4) Non-denominational Christian, (5) Jewish, (6) Eastern Orthodox, (7) Agnostic, (8) Atheist, (9) No religion

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

22. Please indicate your position in the family.
(1) Only child, (2) Oldest child, (3) Youngest child, (4) Middle child, (5) Other ____________
Please Specify

1 2 3 4 5

23. The following are some of the reasons students have indicated for choosing a particular college. Which two best describe your reason for choosing this college rather than another?

	Most Important Reason	Next Most Important Reason
a. My parents wanted me in a Catholic college . . .	____	____
b. Received a scholarship	____	____
c. Convenient location	____	____
d. Near ski areas	____	____
e. Some of my friends were coming here	____	____
f. To learn more about my religion	____	____
g. To be in a good moral environment	____	____
h. To protect my faith from secular thought and influence	____	____
i. For financial reasons	____	____
j. Only college which accepted me	____	____
k. Close proximity to Air Force Academy	____	____
l. Excellent scholastic reputation	____	____
m. Particular program offered	____	____
n. Wanted a woman's college	____	____
o. Other ______________________ . . Please Specify	____	____

24. When meeting with friends during the week (for meals, in the halls, etc.), what do you usually enjoy talking about the most? Circle no more than three.
(1) Campus issues, (2) Classes, (3) National or world affairs, (4) Men, (5) Personal problems, (6) Families, (7) Sports, (8) Clothes, (9) Theological or philosophical matters, (10) Problems of group living

1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10

ANSWER COLUMN

25. Which three of the following would you like most to gain as a result of your college going? Please mark your first, second, and third choices in the appropriate column.

	1st	2nd	3rd
a. Lasting friendships with the students.			
b. Lasting friendships with the faculty.			
c. A gaining of poise and self-confidence			
d. Stimulation of intellectual interests.			
e. Greater tolerance of others.			
f. Preparation for graduate study or profession. .			
g. Self-fulfillment.			
h. Moral betterment.			
i. Extracurricular activities.			
j. Deeper love and knowledge of God and the Church			
k. A liberal education.			
l. Development of leadership capacities			
m. Social and economic betterment			
n. Other ______________________________ . . Please Specify			

26. College students have different ideas about the main purposes of a college education. Some of their ideas are listed below. As you read this list, consider what educational goals you think the IDEAL college OUGHT TO EMPHASIZE. Indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate column for each goal: H (high) - highly important in a college; M (medium) - goals you consider of medium importance; L (low) - goals you consider of little importance, irrelevant, or even distasteful.

	H	M	L
a. Provide vocational training; develop skills and techniques directly applicable to your career. .			
b. Develop your ability to get along with different kinds of people.			
c. Provide a basic general education and appreciation of ideas.			
d. Develop your knowledge and interest in community and world problems.			
e. Help develop your moral capacities, ethical standards and values.			
f. Prepare you for a happy marriage and family life.			

Now go back and rank the items in the H column by marking a 1 for the most important, 2 for the next most important, and so on. Do not mark the M column or the L column.

27. When you pray, why do you pray? Please check as many reasons as apply. Then go back and place a 1, 2, and 3 before the three principal reasons why you pray.

a. As a Christian duty. . . . . ______
b. To find comfort when I am feeling low. . . . . ______
c. To strengthen my faith. . . . . ______
d. To try to learn God's will. . . . . ______
e. To ask God's guidance in making decisions. . . . . . . ______
f. Because it gives me a feeling of being closer to God. . ______
g. To ask forgiveness for something I have done. . . . . ______
h. To ask God to bring someone else to Christian faith and belief. . . . . ______
i. To give thanks to God. . . . . ______
j. To be worshipful of God. . . . . ______

28. What three things or activities in your life do you expect to give you the most satisfaction? Please mark the most important, **next** most important, and third most important in the appropriate column.

	1st	2nd	3rd
a. Your career or occupation.	___	___	___
b. Family relationships.	___	___	___
c. Leisure-time recreational activities.	___	___	___
d. Religious beliefs or activities.	___	___	___
e. Participation as a citizen in the affairs of your country.	___	___	___
f. Participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment.	___	___	___

Please indicate your reaction to the statements below by circling the number in the answer column which corresponds to the choice you select.

ANSWER COLUMN

1. As a rule I enjoy attending lectures or intellectual discussions.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 5

2. (82) The telephone company makes enough money that it doesn't bother me if some people charge long-distance calls to non-existent credit cards.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

3. A student should feel free to request that no Negro be assigned to be her roommate.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

4. After an auto accident, it is all right to ask an insurance company for more money than you deserve.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

5. (68) College students should spend more time thinking about world problems, rather than placing so much emphasis on social and recreational activities.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

6. If I marry, I hope to live in a parish which has an active CFM (Christian Family Movement) or other kind of Catholic Action group.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

7. Police cars should be specially marked so that you can always see them coming.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

8. I seldom discuss the causes and possible solutions of social, political, economic, or international problems.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

9. When I have decisions to make in my everyday life, I ask myself what God would want me to do.
(1) Often, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

10. I have a tendency to choose "snap courses" and avoid tough ones when I have a choice in the matter.
(1) True for me, (2) Somewhat true, (3) Not usually my tendency, (4) Definitely not my tendency — 1 2 3 4 5

11. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

12. A person has all he can do to save his own soul without worrying about the souls of others.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

13. When I was young I pretty much did as my parents wished, but I'm a little old for that now.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

14. Getting drunk can be socially embarrassing, but there's no sense in making a big moral issue out of it.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

15. Art galleries intrigue me.
(86) (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

16. I don't particularly like the idea of making an annual retreat.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

17. The editorial section of the newspaper is the part I like best.
(1) Agree, (2) Agree somewhat, (3) Disagree somewhat, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

18. I think I would enjoy telling others about God and His love for us.
(1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not very much, (4) Wouldn't be my line. — 1 2 3 4 5

		ANSWER COLUMN
19.	The idea of doing research does not appeal to me. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
20.	By the time a girl reaches college, she shouldn't have to continue a formal study of her religion. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
21.	When a Catholic friend of our family dies, personally I would rather send a floral offering than a Mass card as an expression of sympathy. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
22.	Since a good, sincere Protestant can be saved, I see little advantage in being a Catholic. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
23.	If several people find themselves in trouble, the best thing for them to do is to agree upon a story and stick to it. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
24.	It is hard for me to work intently on a scholarly problem for more than an hour or two at a stretch. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
25. (89)	When I sin, the thought of having to tell it in confession is what bothers me most. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
26. (87)	Courses in literature and poetry have been as satisfying to me as most other subjects. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Although I know the Mass is important, it doesn't seem to have much meaning for my daily life. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
28.	I have spent a lot of time listening to serious music. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5

		ANSWER COLUMN
29.	If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. (1) Very likely, (2) Possibly I would, (3) It is unlikely that I would do it, (4) I know I would not do it.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	People who have everything ought to be knocked down a peg or two occasionally. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
31.	Although religion is a great source of comfort to those who are in sorrow, it has little to do with the joyous things of life. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree somewhat, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
32.	Somehow I wouldn't feel too guilty about signing out for one destination, knowing that I was going to another instead. By the time a girl reaches college age, her comings and goings are her own personal business. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
33.	It is of great importance to me that my life work be such that I can be of direct, personal service to others. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
34.	I turn to God for help when I have a difficult decision to make or a difficult task to perform. (1) Regularly, (2) Sometimes, (3) Only occasionally, (4) Almost never	1 2 3 4 5
35.	I have a strong desire for spiritual growth and a deepening of my religious convictions. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
36.	I often feel that it may be best to keep my mouth shut when I'm in trouble. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
37.	I can easily become absorbed in readings recommended by a professor for "those who wish to pursue the matter further." (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5

		ANSWER COLUMN
38.	Necking and deep-kissing are appropriate sex behaviors for unmarried college students. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
39.	I love God, but I have to admit that I rarely give Him a thought as I go about my daily tasks. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
40.	I usually prefer to spend my leisure time reading good books, rather than engaging in social activities. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
41.	I am filled with a sense of gratitude for all God has done for me. (1) Often, (2) Sometimes, (3) Infrequently, (4) Almost never	1 2 3 4 5
42.	I have not given much thought to my personal involvement with Christ. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
43.	I like to use prayers which are reportedly "never known to fail." (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
44. (83)	As a youngster I acquired a strong interest in intellectual and aesthetic matters. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
45. (90)	In my opinion, a deep concern for one's fellow human beings and for their social betterment is an essential aspect of real religion. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
46.	Frankly, I don't have much of a desire to read the Bible. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5
47.	If one comes upon a highway accident, it is better to go on one's way because of possible legal involvements. (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree	1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

48. After a disagreement, it is all right to refuse to talk to a fellow student or a member of one's family, especially if the argument was the fault of the other.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

49. A group of university students destroyed some parking lot equipment to the tune of several hundred dollars. This kind of prank is part of growing up and should not be viewed too seriously.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

50. (63) There should be laws against marriage between persons of different races.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

51. Human passions cause more evil than good in the world.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

52. I like to attend Bible celebrations if they don't last too long.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

53. I have a deep and special liking for prayers of pure praise of God such as the "Gloria," the Preface of the Mass, certain Psalms, and Canticles of the Old and New Testaments.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

54. Sometimes I wish I weren't a Catholic.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

55. When someone does me a wrong, I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disgree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

56. I sometimes wish that a professor would suggest an evening session to discuss further a topic which came up in class.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree — 1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

57. Negro families should not be allowed to move into all-white areas without the residents' consent.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

58. (171) Sometimes when I ask my parents for money, I exaggerate my financial obligations so that they will give me more.
(1) True, (2) Tends to be true, (3) Tends to be false, (4) False 1 2 3 4 5

59. (168) If someone is telling a slightly scandalous story about someone I know, I certainly wouldn't want to miss it.
(1) Very true, (2) Probably true, (3) I wouldn't care if I heard it or not, (4) I would prefer not to hear it. 1 2 3 4 5

60. I enjoy becoming involved in discussions about religion.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

61. I usually find myself praying intensely only in times of crisis or special need.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

62. (167) If I should accidentally break or damage something that belonged to the college, I would be inclined to say nothing.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) Definitely not true 1 2 3 4 5

63. (166) I usually cannot get my mind off a question until I come up with an answer.
(1) Very true, (2) Sometimes true, (3) Seldom true, (4) Never true 1 2 3 4 5

64. Religion doesn't have much relation to the things that interest college students most.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

65. (160) If I heard a person being spoken of unjustly, I probably wouldn't have the courage to come to her defense.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) False 1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

66. If I marry, I would hope to live in a parish where the parents have the privilege of preparing their children for their First Holy Communion.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree
1 2 3 4 5

67.
(163) I listen to risque stories if I get a chance.
(1) True, (2) Tends to be true, (3) Tends to be false, (4) False
1 2 3 4 5

68.
(162) If someone who hurt me deeply met with some misfortune later, I would secretly be glad.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) False
1 2 3 4 5

69. I usually find it more interesting to read the "great books" of history, rather than contemporary novels.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree
1 2 3 4 5

70.
(152) I regularly exceed the speed limit when I am driving.
(1) Yes, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably not, (4) (Definitely not
1 2 3 4 5

71.
(153) If reduced rates for a performance were offered to students, I would probably claim student status even if I were no longer in school.
(1) Yes, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably not, (4) Definitely not
1 2 3 4 5

72.
(157) Although I would like to have a dying relative of mine receive the last sacraments, I would hesitate to call a priest for fear of frightening my relative.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) False
1 2 3 4 5

73. I prefer a quiet Mass in which I can be alone with God, to one involving participation with my fellow Christians.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree
1 2 3 4 5

74. The main object of scientific research should be the discovery of truth, rather than its practical applications.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree
1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

75. If the government continues to make heavy income tax demands on people, they are somewhat justified in paying less than the amount due.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

76. (92) My social life seems to be more important to me than intellectual matters.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

77. Most college students would cheat on an exam if they were sure of not being caught.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

78. If two people are engaged to be married or are really in love, it is not such a serious thing for them to have sexual intercourse.
(1) Agree , (2) Am inclined to agree, (3) Am inclined to disagree, (4) Definitely disagree 1 2 3 4 5

79. It is a good thing to know people in the right places, so you can get traffic tags and such things taken care of.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

80. A salesman has the right to exaggerate how good his product is when a customer isn't too impressed.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

81. If a girl's friends are "of age," she is justified in using a false identification card so that she can be with her crowd.
(1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, (4) Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5

82-84. (119) Indicate as frankly as you can how often you have done each of the following:	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
a. Cheated in exams	____	____	____	____
b. Copied term papers or assignments or handed in a class report that was not your own work	____	____	____	____
c. Taken things which did not belong to you. .	____	____	____	____

ANSWER COLUMN

85-89. Please indicate the degree of your interest
(133) in each of the following areas:

	Much	Some	A Little	None
a. International and world affairs.				
b. Scientific affairs.				
c. Cultural affairs.				
d. Current research in your major field. . . .				
e. Social affairs (dates, parties, and the like).				

90. As far as possible, I leave religion out of my
(172) personal contacts with people.
(1) True, (2) Tends to be true, (3) Tends to be false, (4) False 1 2 3 4 5

91. Even though my parents are spending a large sum
(164) of money for my education, it wouldn't bother me if I did a half-hearted job academically.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) False because it would bother me a little, (4) False because it would bother me a great deal. 1 2 3 4 5

92. If a boy I really like asks me for a date, I would
(156) probably break a date I had made previously with another boy in order to accept the second invitation.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) False 1 2 3 4 5

93. From time to time in my life, I have taken little things from stores or from people's rooms.
(1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never 1 2 3 4 5

94. I am in the habit of using the name of God (or Christ) carelessly in my speech.
(1) Often, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never 1 2 3 4 5

95. I'd like to spend an evening attending a symphony concert.
(1) Very much interested, (2) Somewhat interested, (3) Only slightly interested, (4) Not interested at all 1 2 3 4 5

96. I find myself exaggerating or distorting a story in order to make myself appear better than I am.
(1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never 1 2 3 4 5

97. I find myself pondering over what it means to be a Christian and what kind of Christian I am.
(1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never 1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

98. I would like to be in contact with a priest or religious with whom I could discuss certain aspects of my life as a Christian.
(1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

99. I am in the habit of leaving Sunday Mass before it is over, even when I don't really have to.
(1) Rather regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

100. I read books that will deepen my own life as a Christian.
(1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

101. Sometimes I find myself thinking that heaven will be a boring place to be.
(1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

102. (161) I usually can't live for very long with a lie I've told.
(1) Very true in my case, (2) Somewhat true, (3) Not usually true, (4) False — 1 2 3 4 5

103. I make a short visit to the chapel:
(1) Daily, (2) Several times a week, (3) Occasionally, (4) Almost never — 1 2 3 4 5

104. I shift up and down in my conviction that God will hear my prayers.
(1) Often, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

105. (155) Although I love my religion too much to marry a divorced man, I would not hesitate to date one occasionally.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false, (4) False — 1 2 3 4 5

106. Some time in the past few years the thought has occurred to me that I may have a religious vocation.
(1) Persistently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

107. (145) I have "cut" most of my classes at least two or three times.
(1) Yes, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) No — 1 2 3 4 5

		ANSWER COLUMN				
108.	I have deliberately selected from a book direct quotations for a term paper or a report without using quotation marks to give the author proper credit. (1) Often, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never	1	2	3	4	5
109.	I pray in my own words: (1) Daily, (2) Several times a week, (3) Weekly, (4) Occasionally, (5) Seldom	1	2	3	4	5
110.	In my case, masturbation: (1) Is presently a regular means of sexual gratification, (2) Is presently an occasional means of sexual gratification, (3) Was something I used to indulge in but have outgrown or controlled, (4) Has never been a problem for me.	1	2	3	4	5
111.	I read the daily newspaper and/or news weeklies (e.g., Time, Newsweek): (1) Regularly, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Seldom or never	1	2	3	4	5
112.	I make excuses for my behavior when someone indicates that he is disappointed in me. (1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never	1	2	3	4	5
113.	I use other people's things without their permission. (1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never	1	2	3	4	5
114.	I say the rosary: (1) Daily, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Seldom, (5) Never	1	2	3	4	5
115.	I say morning and/or night prayers: (1) Regularly, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Seldom, (5) Never	1	2	3	4	5
116. (142)	I have sometimes walked away from a ringing phone at a pay station knowing I owed money on a call. (1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) Definitely not	1	2	3	4	5
117.	I find myself "studying" advertisements in order to discover something interesting in them. (1) Regularly, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never	1	2	3	4	5

118. (144) When I am on a regular salary, I will contribute weekly to the support of the Church.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no,
(4) Definitely not 1 2 3 45

119. (141) More than once I've dreamed about having enough time and talent to paint or sculpture.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably not,
(4) Definitely not 1 2 3 45

120. (143) I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no,
(4) Definitely not 1 2 3 45

121. (150) If theology courses were of the same high quality as some of my favorite courses in other fields, I would prefer the courses in theology.
(1) Definitely yes, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably
no, (4) Definitely not 1 2 3 45

122. (139) It puzzles me why some people will so avidly read and discuss science fiction.
(1) Very much, (2) A little, (3) Not usually, (4)
Not at all 1 2 3 45

123. (159) I wouldn't hesitate to take a towel as a souvenir from a hotel in which I stayed.
(1) True, (2) Probably true, (3) Probably false,
(4) False 1 2 3 45

124. If it were left to me completely, and the Church made no regulations or recommendations concerning attendance at Church, I would probably attend religious services:
(1) More than once a week, (2) Once a week, (3)
Once a month or so, (4) Once or twice a year,
(5) Never or almost never 1 2 3 45

125. I would like to collect prints of paintings which I personally enjoy.
(1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not usually,
(4) Not at all 1 2 3 45

126. (146) I would distort information about my qualifications on an application form if I thought it would make the difference between being accepted or not accepted for the position.
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no,
(4) Definitely not 1 2 3 45

	ANSWER COLUMN
127. I enjoy reading Shakespeare's plays. (1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not much, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
128. In my case, a homosexual relationship: (1) Is likely never to occur, (2) Probably would not occur, (3) Could easily occur because of a present involvement, (4) Was a problem at one time in my life but not presently	1 2 3 4 5
129. I like to tell interesting stories about other people, even if they are a little on the "catty" side. (1) Very much, (2) Sometimes, (3) Not usually, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
130. It is important to me to make special sacrifices during Lent. (1) Very much so, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not so important, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
131. I enjoy hearing a great singer in an opera. (1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not usually, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5

THE REMAINDER OF THE ITEMS WILL BE IN QUESTION FORM. PROCEED IN THE SAME MANNER AS YOU HAVE BEEN DOING.

132. (147) If you were driving in another state and got a ticket for parking just a few minutes overtime while getting your lunch, would you bother to pay the fine? (1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) Definitely not	1 2 3 4 5
133. (149) While we're on the subject of money, when you go to some big store where the clerks are busy, they sometimes make mistakes in figuring your change. When you get a few cents more than you're supposed to, do you think it is worth the bother to return the few pennies involved? (1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Usually not, (4) Definitely not	1 2 3 4 5
134. (174) In your classes do you openly question statements and ideas expressed by your professors? (1) Often, (2) Sometimes, (3) Seldom, (4) Almost never	1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

135. (175) Do you analyze what you like or dislike about a movie or a play which you have seen?
(1) Regularly, (2) Sometimes, (3) Occasionally, (4) Almost never 1 2 3 4 5

136. (181) Have you tried your hand at writing poetry, aside from assignments in this area?
(1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Never 1 2 3 4 5

137. (198) What are your feelings about a girl's engaging in heavy petting on a date?
(1) There is nothing wrong with it, (2) It is only a slight transgression, (3) It depends on whether she loves the man or not, (4) It is frequently wrong, (5) It is very seriously wrong. 1 2 3 4 5

138. (178) Do you question the accuracy of statements made in your textbooks or reference books?
(1) Yes, regularly, (2) Yes, occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Almost never 1 2 3 4 5

139. (182) Do you like to imagine what is inside objects?
(1) Often, (2) Sometimes, (3) Rarely, (4) Not at all 1 2 3 4 5

140. (186) Do your conversations with friends deal with such subjects as mutual acquaintances and social activities?
(1) Regularly, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Seldom 1 2 3 4 5

141. (190) In what way has your attitude toward religion changed since you came to college?
(1) I value it much more, (2) I value it more, (3) My attitude has not changed, (4) I value it less, (5) I value it much less. 1 2 3 4 5

142. (197) Do you get a chance to do much serious reading, aside from what you do for your course work?
(1) I do quite a lot of serious reading, (2) I occasionally do, (3) I don't have a chance to do much serious reading, (4) I don't care to do a lot of serious reading. 1 2 3 4 5

143. (228) How would you feel about discussions of the Ideal Society or Utopia?
(1) I would not be interested in such discussions, (2) They probably would be of little interest to me, (3) I would be somewhat interested, (4) I would definitely be interested. 1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

144. (200) Do you enjoy a thought-provoking lecture on a subject within your field of interest?
(1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not much, (4) Almost never
1 2 3 4 5

145. (189) Suppose a friend told you he had been offered an attractive business deal by a Jewish businessman, but wondered if he should risk trusting a Jew in business. What would you most likely advise him?
(1) To avoid deals with a Jew, (2) To be very careful of dealing with a Jew, (3) To go ahead, but be somewhat careful, (4) To go ahead because Jews are no more likely to be dishonest in business than Christians are.
1 2 3 4 5

146. (213) Do you like assignments which require you to draw your own conclusions from some data or body of facts?
(1) Not at all, (2) Not much, (3) Somewhat, (4) Very much
1 2 3 4 5

147. (194) Not counting time in class, about how many hours do you spend in actual study during a typical seven-day week?
(1) 5-10 hours, (2) 10-15 hours, (3) 15-20 hours, (4) 20-30 hours, (5) More than 30 hours
1 2 3 4 5

148. (184) Do you like short, factual questions in an examination, rather than questions which require the organization and interpretation of a large body of material?
(1) Usually, (2) Occasionally, (3) Not usually, (4) Almost never
1 2 3 4 5

149. (193) How do you feel about helping another student to cheat on an exam?
(1) It is all right, (2) It is wrong, but not seriously, (3) It is a serious breach against honesty, (4) It is very seriously wrong.
1 2 3 4 5

150. (229) Do you prefer popular music to classical music?
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Usually not, (4) Definitely not
1 2 3 4 5

151. (230) Do you prefer to have a principle or theory explained to you, rather than studying it out for yourself?
(1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) Definitely not
1 2 3 4 5

	ANSWER COLUMN
152. (219) Would you enjoy writing a paper on the possible long time effects or outcomes of a significant research discovery? (1) Very much, (2) A little, (3) Not very much, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
153. (192) Assuming that the quality of education is comparable to other schools in the community, how important is it to you that your children attend a Catholic school? (1) Very important, (2) Rather important, (3) Not too important, (4) Not at all important	1 2 3 4 5
154. (177) Do you analyze new ideas which you hear or read about to see if they fit in with your own point of view? (1) Definitely, (2) Usually, (3) Seldom, (4) Almost never	1 2 3 4 5
155. (199) How much do you enjoy reading poetry? (1) Very much, (2) Moderately, (3) Not much, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
156. (215) Do you enjoy solving problems of the type found in geometry, philosophy, or logic? (1) Very much, (2) Sometimes, (3) Rarely, (4) Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
157. (220) If a Negro with the same income and education as you were going to move into your block, how would you probably react? (1) I would look forward to it, (2) I wouldn't know until I met him, (3) I would be somewhat apprehensive, (4) I would be upset by it.	1 2 3 4 5
158. (183) Would you prefer to go to a dance or party than a play? (1) Usually, (2) Occasionally, (3) Seldom, (4) Almost never	1 2 3 4 5
159. (224) Do you dislike test questions in which the information being tested is in a form different from that in which it was learned? (1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) Definitely no	1 2 3 4 5
160. (226) Are you bored by discussions of what life will be like one hundred years from now? (1) Definitely, (2) Probably yes, (3) Probably no, (4) Definitely not	1 2 3 4 5

ANSWER COLUMN

161. (196) To what extent do you seriously disagree with the principal dogmas of your religion?
(1) In many respects, (2) In some respects, (3) In a few respects, (4) In no respects — 1 2 3 4 5

162. (210) Do you prefer movies of the musical comedy type to movies which are biographical or historical?
(1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Usually not, (4) Not at all — 1 2 3 4 5

163. (208) Do you like to discuss philosophical problems?
(1) Very much, (2) Sometimes, (3) Rarely, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

164. (221) If you should marry, how important is it to you that your marriage should be witnessed by a priest?
(1) Very important, (2) Somewhat important, (3) Not very important, (4) Not important — 1 2 3 4 5

165. (201) Do you prefer a long, rather involved problem, rather than several short ones?
(1) Very much, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not usually, (4) Not at all — 1 2 3 4 5

166. For the purpose of preventing pregnancy, have you ever used "the pill" or other contraceptives?
(1) Yes, somewhat regularly, (2) Yes, on a number of occasions, (3) Only once or twice, (4) Never — 1 2 3 4 5

167. (188) How often do you say grace before meals?
(1) Regularly, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Seldom — 1 2 3 4 5

168. (216) Do you like to solve "brain teasers?"
(1) Very much, (2) Sometimes, (3) Rarely, (4) Not at all — 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS TO FACULTY MEMBERS FOR SELECTING IDEAL STUDENTS[1]

Dear Faculty Member:

Since, in our opinion, the best judges of successful college performance are the teaching faculty, we should like the teachers to nominate a group of superior students whose records will be studied. We would like to ask each of you to give us the names of any students in the present sophomore, junior, and senior classes who seem to belong to such a group. We are not attempting to define the criteria for selection, realizing that there are different kinds of excellence among students whose development and achievement during their college years are such as to make their teachers think of each: "She is the kind of young woman we want at _______________ College."

Obviously, if we were interested in grades alone, we could select our group from available records. While we could expect most of the students nominated to have done generally superior work in college, it is possible that some have been outstanding in one field and would be overlooked if we relied on the grade point average as the basis for selection.

Although we are not asking for any definition of general criteria for nominations, if possible we should like to know the basis for specific selections. Therefore, we would like you to indicate briefly, next to each student's name, why you think she should be included in this study.

If none of the members of the present sophomore, junior, and senior classes seems to be of the caliber that we are trying to identify, please return the nomination sheets with a statement to that effect.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

President[2]

---

[1] This letter, sent to all full-time faculty members at both participating institutions, is a copy--with some alterations--of the one used in the 1957 Vassar College Study.

[2] At School II the letter was sent by the dean of faculties.

APPENDIX F

LIST OF THE 86 VARIABLES IN THE STUDY

1. GPA
2. CEEB (verbal)
3. CEEB (math)
4. CEEB (total)
5. Ideal
6. Year in college (1b)[1]
7. High school average (2b)
8. Public high school (3b)
9. Parish/diocesan high school (3b)
10. Private Catholic high school (3b)
11. Private non-sectarian high school (3b)
12. Public elementary school (4b)
13. Parish/diocesan elementary school (4b)
14. Private Catholic elementary school (4b)
15. Private non-sectarian elementary school (4b)

16-17. High school enrollment under 500 (5b)

18-19. High school enrollment 500-1000 (5b)

20. High school enrollment 1000-1400 (5b)

21-25. High school enrollment over 1400 (5b)

26. Type of home community (6b)
27. Area of academic concentration (7b)
28. Teacher education program (8b)
29. Visit to off-campus bookstore for browsing (9b)
30. Attendance at plays (9b)
31. Visits to public library (9b)
32. Attendance at concerts, symphony, ballet (9b)
33. Visits to art galleries, exhibits (9b)
34. Attendance at public lectures (9b)
35. Member of apostolic organization (10b)
36. Former member of apostolic organization (10b)
37. Involved in volunteer work (10b)
38. Not involved in volunteer work (10b)
39. Never a member of apostolic organization (10b)
40. Mass attendance (11b)
41. Reception of Holy Communion (12b)
42. Frequency of confession (13b)
43. Source of religious attitude change (14b)
44. Graduate school (15b)

---

[1] Number in parentheses refers to the item number in the questionnaire; "b" refers to Section 1 of the questionnaire, background factors.

45. Father's occupation (16b)
46. Father's educational level (17b)
47. Mother's educational level (18b)
48. Parents' marital status (19b)
49. Father's religion (20b)
50. Mother's religion (21b)
51. Position in family (22b)
52. Most important reason for choosing ____________ College (23b)
53. Next most important reason for choosing _________ College (23b)
54-56. Conversation topics (24b)
57. College expectations--first choice (25b)
58. College expectations--second choice (25b)
59. College expectations--third choice (25b)
60. Educational goals of ideal college--first choice (26b)
61. Educational goals of ideal college--second choice (26b)
62. Educational goals of ideal college--third choice (26b)
63-65. Educational goals of ideal college--4th-6th choices (26b)
66. Reasons for praying--first choice (27b)
67. Reasons for praying--second choice (27b)
68. Reasons for praying--third choice (27b)
69. Life satisfactions--first choice (28b)
70. Life satisfactions--second choice (28b)
71. Life satisfactions--third choice (28b)
72. Factor I (Religious Values)
73. Factor II (Consensual Religiosity)
74. Factor III (Honesty, fairness)
75. Factor IV (Cheating, stealing)
76. Factor V (Jealousy, revenge)
77. Factor VI ("Catty," risque, scandalous stories)
78. Factor VII (Prejudice)
79. Factor VIII (Intellectual Values)
80. Factor IX (World affairs interest)
81. Factor X (Aesthetic Values)
82-84. Sexual morality (Items 166, 110, 128)
85. Sexual morality (Items 120, 137)
86. Concern for others (Items 12, 47)

APPENDIX G

DIRECTION OF SCORING FOR THE TEN FACTORS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Factor	Low Score	High Score
I	Religious	Irreligious
II	Consensually religious	Commitedly religious
III	Dishonest	Honest
IV	Inclined toward cheating	Opposed to cheating
V	Jealous, revengeful	Not jealous or revengeful
VI	Interested in "catty," scandalous, or risque stories	Disinterested in "catty," scandalous, or risque stories
VII	Prejudiced	Non-prejudiced
VIII	Scholarly, intellectual	Not scholarly or intellectual
IX	Interested in world affairs and serious reading	Disinterested in world affairs and serious reading
X	Interested in fine arts	Disinterested in fine arts

APPENDIX H

MATRIX OF SIGNIFICANT INTERCORRELATIONS[1] AMONG RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND TEST VARIABLES FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	29	30	31	32
1		158**	195**	195**	396**	539**	-236**	066	022	-049	026
2	779		580**	883**	050	001	-440**	146**	160**	116**	30**
3	779	1083		888**	065	-001	-442**	088**	074*	084**	037
4	779	1083	1083		066	-004	-497**	128**	131**	110**	095**
5	648	595	595	595		266**	-113**	-001	049	-121**	068
6	844	1083	1083	1-83	650		019	117**	116**	-059	113**
7	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156		-065*	-135**	-124**	-116**
29	833	1063	1063	1063	641	1136	1136		244**	138**	159**
30	834	1074	1074	1074	643	1145	1145	1127		191**	393**
31	830	1071	1071	1071	642	1141	1141	1123	1138		078*
32	828	1068	1068	1068	636	1137	1137	1118	1134	1130	
33	832	1070	1070	1070	642	1142	1142	1124	1139	1135	1130
34	824	1061	1061	1961	637	1132	1132	1114	1129	1126	1125
40	802	1044	1044	1044	618	1101	1101	1082	1092	1087	1086
41	805	1049	1049	1049	621	1107	1107	1088	1098	1094	1092
42	795	1041	1041	1041	613	1094	1094	1075	1085	1081	1079
43	771	988	988	988	583	1051	1051	1036	1042	1038	1036
44	841	1080	1080	1080	647	1152	1152	1133	1142	1138	1134
45	832	1070	1070	1070	639	1141	1141	1122	1032	1127	1124
46	839	1079	1079	1079	645	1151	1151	1132	1142	1137	1134
47	842	1082	1082	1082	648	1154	1154	1135	1145	1140	1137
69	834	1073	1073	1073	641	1146	1146	1126	1135	1131	1128
72	844	1082	1082	1082	650	1155	1155	1136	1144	1140	1136
73	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
74	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
75	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
76	843	1082	1082	1082	649	1155	1155	1135	1144	1140	1136
77	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
78	844	1082	1082	1082	650	1155	1155	1136	1144	1140	1136
79	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
80	844	1082	1082	1082	650	1155	1155	1136	1144	1140	1136
81	844	1083	1083	1083	650	1156	1156	1136	1145	1141	1137
87	844	1082	1082	1082	650	1155	1155	1136	1144	1140	1136

CORRELATION MATRIX (continued)

Variable	33	34	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	69
1	*075	**199	*-075	-031	002	**-242	**-117	064	-065	-067	-008
2	**128	004	-032	-058	**098	-026	**-130	**074	-053	-045	*065
3	-005	-003	**-121	**-155	-036	-034	-001	*078	-053	*-072	034
4	*067	002	*-079	**-115	034	-030	*-069	**089	*-063	*-065	051
5	049	**193	**-179	**-122	**-102	**-144	**-107	-003	026	005	072
6	**110	**263	-056	-013	**100	**-343	**-099	**084	**-082	**-146	-029
7	-011	-011	**137	**170	**079	013	055	**-139	**116	**088	**-081
29	**295	**204	001	-005	**106	*-078	**-081	-032	012	020	-003
30	**303	**266	-026	-042	031	**-117	-057	003	001	027	011
31	**145	**134	022	006	018	049	-026	*069	-050	-006	015
32	**282	**282	-056	-034	041	**-082	**-099	-008	*070	057	023
33		**286	012	043	**090	**-104	**-097	012	010	021	-019
34	1128		**-096	-053	**064	**-228	**-096	-053	041	047	009
40	1089	1078		**644	**380	*077	008	056	-028	-001	**-177
41	1095	1084	1094		**488	044	-036	051	-028	-034	**-146
42	1082	1071	1090	1094		-049	**-107	023	-006	-020	-014
43	1040	1033	1015	1022	1011		026	-007	014	040	019
44	1139	1129	1099	1105	1092	1049		-005	-005	-021	-012
45	1129	1118	1089	1095	1082	1038	1138		**-633	**-289	-016
46	1138	1128	1098	1104	1091	1048	1148	1141		**467	001
47	1141	1131	1101	1107	1094	1051	1151	1141	1151		-016
69	1132	1123	1094	1101	1088	1046	1142	1131	1141	1144	
72	1141	1131	1100	1106	1093	1050	1151	1140	1150	1153	1145
73	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1154	1146
74	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1154	1146
75	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1143	1146
76	1141	1131	1100	1106	1093	1050	1151	1140	1150	1153	1145
77	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1143	1146
78	1141	1131	1100	1106	1093	1050	1151	1140	1150	1153	1145
79	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1143	1146
80	1141	1131	1100	1106	1093	1050	1151	1140	1150	1153	1145
81	1142	1132	1101	1107	1094	1051	1152	1141	1151	1154	1146
87	1141	1131	1100	1106	1093	1050	1151	1140	1150	1153	1145

CORRELATION MATRIX (continued)

Variable	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	87
1	-007	133**	098**	186*	042	047	069	-144**	-032	-044	-245**
2	-018	158	069*	109**	032	039	220**	-306**	-194**	-295**	311**
3	-118**	152**	102**	117**	016	079**	168**	-263**	-011	-070*	238**
4	-076*	175**	096**	126**	032	065*	214**	-318**	-110**	-201**	309**
5	-164**	111**	120**	115**	063	122**	089**	-145**	-032	-061	-569**
6	002	074*	-023	042	081**	-030	-029	-149**	-129**	-108**	103**
7	180**	-129**	-177**	-178**	-052	-099**	-125**	235**	094**	133**	-208**
29	-012	048	-012	027	075*	011	061*	-272**	-252**	-324**	158**
30	-056	125	070*	064*	049	050	053	-243**	-227**	-313**	208**
31	-051	026	090**	063*	035	022	057	-151**	-129**	-130**	214**
32	-058	074*	065*	066*	036	077*	064*	-253**	-213**	-371**	094**
33	013	063*	040	035	117*	-008	048	-300**	-261**	-436**	159**
34	-064*	056	029	030	103**	030	073*	-309**	-290**	-201**	046
40	517**	-140**	-143**	-067*	-056	-076*	-084**	020	030	001	025
41	589**	-162**	-183**	-102**	-103**	-071*	-086**	066*	022	-031	-026
42	497**	-072*	-156**	-035	018	-078*	-017	-058	-063*	-126**	156**
43	-001	-076*	048	001	-074*	037	-029	142**	074*	113**	-125**
44	-062*	-065*	-014	-056	-013	-034	-062*	150**	131**	112**	-034
45	-005	032	090**	085**	001	054	027	-040	-014	-025	141**
46	044	-084**	-106**	-102**	-040	-046	-048	030	-018	023	-136**
47	036	-037	-053	-070*	-066*	-015	004	030	-030	009	-113**
69	-227**	046	067*	031	040	035	085**	-068*	004	-081**	029
72		-260**	-388**	-218**	-225**	-287**	-130**	162**	040	169*	-23
73	1155		286**	369**	282**	380**	173**	-175**	-088**	-097**	051
74	1155	1156		468**	432**	357**	243**	-159**	-153**	-097**	-027
75	1155	1156	1155		213**	688**	152**	-159**	-076*	-048	037
76	1154	1155	1156	1155		140**	193**	-152**	-103**	-120**	033
77	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155		147**	-147**	-157**	-015	-005
78	1155	1155	1156	1155	1154	1155		-177**	-162**	-145**	027
79	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155		477**	544**	-216**
80	1155	1155	1156	1155	1154	1155	1155	1155		433**	-153**
81	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155	1156	1155		-224**
87	1155	1155	1155	1155	1154	1155	1155	1155	1155	1155	

Note.--Variables 72-81 are the ten factors. Variable 87 is the indicator of inter-school differences. Appendix F lists all the variables of the study.

[1] Correlations are charted above the diagonal; N's are charted below the diagonal. Decimal points are omitted.

*Significant beyond .05 level of confidence

**Significant beyond .01 level of confidence